CD 456
(120)
Inw 16/7/58
L.841

P.E.O. Publication No. 26.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

OFFICE OF THE PRINCIPAL
16 JUL 1958
KOVILPATTI
RURAL EXTENSION TRAINING CENTRE

सत्यमेव जयते

R.E.T.C. LIBRARY
CP.67
841.
KOVILPATTI.
CD 453

THE FIFTH EVALUATION REPORT

ON WORKING OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND N.E.S. BLOCKS

778
GOI

MAY, 1958

PROGRAMME EVALUATION ORGANISATION
PLANNING COMMISSION

their multifarious duties, the part they have played in development activities and finally, the handicaps they suffer from, because of the lack of qualification and experience on the part of their members, lack of interest on that of the average villager and the paucity of internal resources. So far the panchayats, in most areas, have either stood outside the development programme or been loosely associated with it. The new pattern, however, includes a separate block level panchayat specialist. This step together with the acceptance of the principle of democratic decentralisation should bring the panchayats into closer association with the development programme. But to establish their proper role, it is necessary to understand their strength and weakness as they have been over the last 30 years or more. The present study should assist in this understanding.

The last chapter describes, in some detail, the current position regarding the maintenance of records in the development blocks. Data on the methods of record keeping, the concepts and standards involved, the coverage of particular items and the adequacy of checking and inspection have been assembled and analysed. The records maintained by the Gram Sevak—the functionary at the base of the organisation and in slight of what is happening in the villages—are the primary source of the material on which the administrators base their judgment and formulate their policy. In earlier Evaluation Reports general comments were made on the deficiency of the records kept by the block staff. The present study has made a special enquiry into this question and brought out detailed information. Better records are an urgent improvement for which this study may be found useful.

CHAPTER II

CURRENT EVALUATION STUDY

A GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS IN 82 CD AND NES BLOCKS

Besides continuous and intensive study of progress of the programme and detailed enquiries and surveys on its impact in the permanent evaluation centres, the PEO has made studies in other CD and NES blocks from time to time. In 1955-56, the PEO made an intensive study of 13 NES blocks, the data of which were published in the Evaluation Report, 1956. Similarly, in the 1957 Evaluation Report, the observations in some chapters were based on the data collected in 1-2 blocks besides the evaluation centres.

In view of the very rapid increase in the number of CD and NES blocks during the last 2 years, it was felt that a rapid survey of a sufficiently large number of blocks, aiming primarily to assess general progress and to bring out problems experienced in the functioning of blocks, would be useful. Accordingly, it was decided to select for study about 80 blocks (in addition to the 20 evaluation centres) and to conduct in each a rapid current evaluation enquiry lasting for a period of 2-3 weeks.

Selection of blocks

The selection of blocks for this study was confined to the CD and NES blocks which had completed one year of working on 30th September, 1957.* The blocks which were less than a year old were not considered because it was felt that in these progress might not be sufficient to make the assessment fruitful. The PIP blocks were also not included because these are adequately represented among the existing evaluation centres of the PEO. All the blocks in a State which were considered eligible for selection were divided into two strata—CD and NES—and were further divided into geographical regions. From each of the cells which emerged from this cross-division, one (and in a very few cases two) block was selected at random. In each State, roughly 1/15th of the total number of the eligible blocks were thus selected. The selection was then communicated to State Governments for their comments. It was essential to obtain these comments, because information on such matters as whether the block had a BDO in position or whether there was any special situation (*e.g.* occurrence of a flood) which might make the study fruitless in a particular block was not available with the PEO. Mobifications by the State Governments were suggested in some cases. A total of 84 blocks—37 CD and 47 NES—were thus selected. The enquiry could not, however, be conducted in two blocks of Bombay State due to the illness of the concerned PEO, and 82 blocks—36 CD and 46 NES—were finally included in the enquiry. These blocks are located in all major States except Jammu & Kashmir and also at the rate of one each in Delhi, Manipur and NEFA. The maximum

*One block of U.P. is considered as less than one year old because even though it was inaugurated in October, 1956, work was not started in it until December, 1956.

number of blocks among the States are 11 in U.P. The distribution of blocks by States and districts is given in Appendix I. It has, however, not been considered proper to give the names of individual blocks.

The enquiry was conducted by the PEOs, each of whom got 3-6 blocks. The field work for the enquiry was completed between October, 1957 and January, 1958.

Method

As its primary objective was to obtain general information on progress, method of working and problems experienced in working of the blocks, the enquiry was conducted mainly through discussions and interviews with the persons concerned—the BDO, the block level subject-matter specialists, the Gram Sevaks, selected members of the BAC, and the district level officers of the concerned departments. In many cases, the PEOs could interview the Collector of the district also for a general discussion. Information was gathered from all these persons through general discussions and by filling questionnaires and schedules. As the enquiry was an attempt to obtain an appraisal of the programme in a large number of blocks situated in different economic, physical and administrative conditions, it was essential to ensure that the PEOs' observations were not based on general impressions. The schedules and questionnaires were designed with this end in view and sought to quantify data to the maximum extent possible. Further, factual data on finance, activities and similar subjects was obtained from the block records to the extent necessary.

The enquiry can be considered to have been conducted at three levels—the block, the selected villages and the district. The PEO first spent a few days at the block headquarters for general discussions and interviews with the BDO and the block level specialists. Next, he visited the five selected villages. After completing these village visits, he completed the enquiry at the block level and then moved to the district level where he interviewed the district level officers and wherever possible, the Collector.

Questionnaires and schedules

About 25 questionnaires and schedules were used for the enquiry. The questionnaire for interview with the BDO was the most comprehensive as it extended over the entire field of block activity. The questionnaires for the other officials related to their particular field of activity and sought to obtain information on achievements in the field, methods of work, assistance received from superiors and extended to those nearer the field, attitudes towards the job, problems and personal difficulties, if any. The questionnaire for non-officials related to the functioning of the Block Advisory Committee.

Selection of villages

The PEO first selected at random 5 Gram Sevaks out of the 10 or more working in the block. Each Gram Sevak was asked to name two villages which were easily accessible but which were average in performance. Out of these two villages, one was selected at random. Some bias towards selection of better than average

villages is possible in this method as the Gram Sevaks may have a tendency to name better than average villages. But the object of selecting the villages was not to get quantitative data on performance. The main object was to acquaint the PEOs with the operation of the block programme so that they may be able to understand more adequately the reports and views of the block staff and the Gram Sevaks. The village visits were also considered useful as a check on the data collected through the schedules, on patterns of visits of the Gram Sevaks and subject-matters specialists and on performance in case of works and institutional programmes. The village data have been utilized mainly for these purposes and have not been commented upon in this report except in case of programmes for the under-privileged groups and panchayats.

Block note

At the end of the enquiry, the PEO wrote a general note on the programme in the block, in which he summarised his observations on work in the block. No outline was given for the note and the PEO was free to comment on any matter which he considered important. One object of the note was to get over some of the limitations of the questionnaire method and to enable him to express himself fully. The limitation of getting data on such matters as attitude towards the job, assistance received from superiors or given to the field staff through this method should be kept in view and the data should be treated with the necessary caution. The use of this method is an attempt to quantify observations in the difficult field of operation of programmes.

General information

Population and number of villages

According to the pattern envisaged by the Ministry of Community Development, a development block should have a population of 66,000. In sparsely populated hilly or mountainous areas or in those inhabited by tribal people, the population of the block may be considerably lower. In the tribal areas, the block may have a population of only 25,000 to 30,000. As Table 1 shows, the development blocks selected for this study do not exactly conform to this pattern.

The average number of villages in a development block works out to 126, or 25% higher than in the pattern. There is not much difference in this respect between the CD and NES blocks. However, the range of inter-block variation is very large—from a minimum of 10 villages in a block in Kerala to a maximum of 441 in a tribal-area block in Madhya Pradesh. The State averages too vary all the way from 14 villages for the three blocks of Kerala to 285 for two blocks of Himachal Pradesh. The number of villages in a block is, however, not an adequate criterion for defining its size; the population of what is called a "village" varies very greatly in different parts of the country and the amount of work to be done in a village is obviously related to the size of its population. In Kerala, for instance, where there are no well-defined villages, the revenue division which is called a 'village' has generally a large population of 5,000 to 10,000 persons or more. On the other hand, in mountainous Himachal Pradesh, a village is extremely small in size, being often

not more than a cluster of a few houses. Evidently, in judging the size of a block one should take into account its total population too. The following figures show the distribution of blocks included in this study, by size of population :—

(i) Below 66,000	27
(ii) 66,000 to 1 lakh	45
(iii) 1 lakh to 1½ to lakhs	8
(iv) 1½ lakhs and above	2

CD402/1

The figures show that 2/3rds of the blocks have populations above the prescribed size. And of the remaining one-third which have populations below 66,000, nearly half are in mountainous, hilly or tribal areas where the density of population is low and where the block is supposed to have a much smaller population (of between 25,000 to 40,000). The average block has a population of 75,000. If these 13 blocks in hilly and tribal areas are excluded, the average population of the blocks studied rises to somewhat over 82,000 which is about 25% higher than the figure envisaged in the pattern.*

The inter-State and inter-block variations in terms of population are narrower than for the number of villages. These are, however, still very large, extending from a minimum of 12,900 in a block in NEFA to a maximum of 183,800 in a Bombay block. The latter is really closer to a three block community project than to a single development block. Thus, the States appear, in practice, to have in most cases gone for a large unit than that indicated by the Ministry of Community Development. This preference may have been influenced partly by financial considerations and partly by the need to make the blocks fit into the existing administrative units as much as practicable.

The block pattern does not prescribe any area limits. Large blocks are impracticable in the densely populated plains of the North or in the coastal areas of the South. But in the sparsely populated, hilly, mountainous or desert areas of the country, such blocks are not uncommon. Thus, one Rajasthan block included in this study has an area of 1,654 square miles and another in Manipur has an area of 1,200 square miles. Altogether, 10 blocks have areas between 500 and 1,000 square miles. Besides, these blocks have poor communication facilities so that it is doubly difficult for the block staff and the Gram Sevaks to serve the whole area. In delimiting a block its area should be taken into account along with other factors like population, number of villages and existing administrative boundaries. The manner in which these factors combine vary from region to region and it may be necessary to have different optimum blocks for different areas.

Block and the existing administrative units

In some of the Northern States like Punjab and U.P. where the tehsil, the basic unit of administration below the district, is fairly large, fitting the 'block' into the existing administrative structure

*It may be of interest to note that according to the pattern visualized by the COPP Team an average block would have a population of 80,000.— Study Team for CD & NES COPP Report, Vol. I, page 36.

does not present a serious problem; an avarage tehsil can be conveniently split into two or three blocks. However, even in these States the question will assume great importance when the block is made the primary unit of development and of democratic decentralisation as suggested by the COPP Team because then the relative importance of the tehsil and the block as units of administration will have to be determined. In some of the Southern States, on the other hand, where the basic unit of administration, the taluka, is often not much larger than the block, the problem has already arisen. Some idea of the extent of the problem and the adjustments which have been attempted by the States is given by the following figures, showing the number of blocks which are coterminous with existing administrative units, those less than the latter and those extending across two administrative units.

Particulars		No. of blocks
1. Blocks from which information received		68
2. Blocks coterminous with any administrative unit :		8
(a) With taluk		
(b) With anchal	5	
(c) With tehsil	6	
(d) With thana or police station	3	
(e) With 'mahal'	1	
3. Blocks covering less than the area of an administrative unit		33
4. Blocks covering parts of more than one administrative unit		7
5. Blocks having population more than 66,000		55
6. Blocks coterminous with any administrative unit having a population of more than 66,000.		19

It will be seen that out of 68 blocks for which information is available, as many as 28 are coterminous with existing units like talukas, thanas, tehsils or anchals. Another 33 blocks cover less than the area of the existing administrative units, while as many as 7 blocks extend into the areas of two units. Of the 28 blocks in the first category, as many as 19 have populations above 66,000. The largest number of such blocks is found in Bombay, Bihar, Mysore and Rajasthan. In all these cases, revenue and development functions are combined in the same block level officer and the need for breaking up the existing revenue units is obvious.

The attempt to fit the block into the existing administrative unit is sensible; indeed to break up, except for very good reasons, existing administrative units which have evolved over long periods of time and are often based on sound geographical and economic considerations would be a retrograde step. But one can make the opposite mistake; sometimes talukas with extremely large populations

have been constituted into blocks. Thus, two Bombay talukas with populations of 1·60 lakhs and 1·84 lakhs respectively have been constituted into two blocks. These are considered equivalent to two and two and a half blocks respectively by the State Government, but the blocks have one B.D.O. each and the block staff is not proportionate to the population. In both cases only one additional Agriculture Officer has been provided. It is obvious that in such cases the talukas should have been divided into 2 or 3 blocks.

The question of size of the development unit has already assumed considerable importance but will become even more important as thinking on further steps to democratise the development machinery develops. It is obvious that there cannot be two basic units: *viz.* the taluka or anchal or tehsil for general administration and the block for development. A single unit will have to be adopted for both purposes. In the Southern States where the existing administrative unit, the taluka, is not much larger than the block, it might be best to make this the unit of development instead of carving out new units. But where the taluka is very large, as in some instances in the State of Bombay, it will be necessary to break it up into suitable number of blocks. In the Northern States, the relation between the tehsil and the block will have to be seriously considered.

But the attempt to adjust blocks to administrative units should not be at the expense of the resources in men and money available to the former. The Bombay taluka mentioned above is probably an extreme case, but less extreme instances are not uncommon. A large number of blocks with populations above 66,000 have neither the staff nor the finance adequate to their size. Financial allotments can be increased without difficulty, although the increase in staff does present some problems. A block cannot have more than one BDO. But a senior and experienced person can be appointed to the post and he can be given suitable assistance to enable him to look after the larger area. Among the subject-matter specialists, it is specially necessary to have an adequate strength in fields like agriculture ; otherwise the increase in population will only result in the dilution of effort.

In view of the large variations in population, inter-block and inter-State, which cannot be avoided because of important administrative considerations, serious attention has to be paid to working out appropriate norms of budget, staff, etc. for blocks with different population ranges. An increase in the population of a block should not automatically lead to a proportionate reduction in its finance and staff. This happens all too frequently at present.

STAFF

The Block Development Officer

The BDO is the key functionary in the block. Progress of block programme depends more upon him than on any other single functionary and there can be hardly any work in his absence. Factors which influence performance of the B.D.O.—educational qualifications, training received for block work, background, experience, age,

personal qualities like aptitude for extension work, attitude, and satisfaction with job, etc.—have therefore a great influence on progress of the programme. Data relating to some of these personal characteristics and on posting and turnover of BDOs are given in Table 2. It will be seen that as many as 16 (out of 35) CD blocks report absence of BDO at some time or the other during the course of their working. The average duration of absence was 5 months. 12 of these blocks experienced this difficulty in the present phase. From among the NES blocks, 15 out of 46 experienced the absence of the BDO for an average period of 4 months. Thus a total of 31 blocks, or about 40% of all the blocks studied, suffered from the absence of a Block Development Officer for some period or other, the average period being nearly 5 months. These figures illustrate the difficulties which the States have been experiencing in posting even the key officer, the BDO, in the rapidly increasing number of blocks.

Turn-over

It is generally recognised that in order to ensure continuity, speed and progress of the block programme, a BDO should not be changed during the duration of the block. This was recommended by the P.E.O. in its first report, and the Ministry of Community Development have urged adherence to this practice on more than one occasion. In exceptional cases, because of administrative or personal reasons, it may be necessary to depart from the practice. But, there is no question that rapid turn-over of BDOs is a serious impediment to progress. The extent of turn-over of BDOs in the selected blocks is as follows :—

Order of the present BDO	No. of Blocks		
	CD		NES
	Since inauguration	In the present phase	
1	11	22	23
2	10	9	14
3	7	2	3
4	3	..	1
More than 4	2	1	2
	33**	34*	43*

*Information n.a. for 2 blocks.

**Information n.a. for 3 blocks.

Thus among the blocks selected for this study, although there are a few which have had too rapid turn-over, the general situation is not such as should cause concern. Out of the 33 community development blocks, 21 had one or two BDOs; 7 had 3 and the remaining 5 had 4 or more. In two blocks, one in Mysore and one in West Bengal, the present BDOs are the eighth since the inauguration of the blocks. Among the NES blocks which have had considerably shorter duration, in 23 cases the present BDO is the first, in another 14 he is the second and only 6 blocks have had more than 2 BDOs.

Personal characteristics:

Information on personal characteristics of BDOs is available for 81 out of 82 blocks studied. The first interesting fact which emerges from the study is that there is no BDO with a background of social or political work. In the first community projects, a number of people with such background had been drawn into project work This source is no longer a contributor. Open market recruitment is also not an important source of filling up the post. It was reported so in only 4 cases. Among the remaining BDOs, 69 have liens in some department and another 4 were temporary employees of a department before joining the present post. It can, therefore, be said that practically all BDOs are persons with previous experience of work in some government department. In most cases, their work has been in the rural areas as officials of the Revenue, Agriculture or other development departments. 32 BDOs or 42% of those having previous government service experience come from the Revenue Department. Another 14 or 18% come from the Agriculture Department. The remainder are distributed among the other departments. In the areas of former Bombay State, where the revenue and development functions are integrated at the block level and below, all the BDOs are from the Revenue Department. In Bihar, which has such integration at the block level, all the BDOs are drawn from the Junior Civil Service of the State. In Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan also all the BDOs are from the Revenue Department. Excepting these States, however, progress has been made in drawing the non-Revenue Department people into the post of the BDO. In Madras, U.P., Punjab and West Bengal especially, a number of blocks have BDOs drawn from departments other than the Revenue. It may be recalled that this steps has been recommended by the Ministry of Community Development and in more than one Evaluation Report.

Some of the other facts brought out by this table are also of considerable interest. An average BDO is a graduate or a person with higher academic qualifications (there are only nine undergraduates among them); he has seen a total service of about 12 years, of which 2 years and 4 months have been spent on community development or NES work. Almost all BDOs (77 out of 81) satisfy the minimum qualifications for the post, but only 80% have received the prescribed training.

To get some idea of his attitude towards his present post, each BDO was asked two questions:

(i) whether he regarded the post as a promotion or demotion; and

(ii) whether he was satisfied with the conditions of service.

The data obtained from these direct questions have obvious limitations. It is not possible to get the officers' detailed or at times even true reactions by such direct questioning. But, in a study where the contact of the PEO with the BDO was limited to a week to ten days it was obviously not possible to adopt a different method. In cases, where the PEO from his personal contact felt that the BDO's reply did not reflect his true reaction, necessary corrections were made.

32 BDOs or about 40% of the total regard the post as a promotion; an equal number feel that it is neither a promotion nor a demotion, and the number regarding it as a demotion or one affecting their career is very small (6). But the numbers who are dissatisfied with the conditions of service or would like to go back to their parent departments are by no means insignificant. 23 out of the 81 BDOs, or more than a fourth of the total, feel that way. Apparently, a large number of those who do not consider the posting as a promotion are not satisfied with the conditions of service. The proportion is particularly high in Andhra, West Bengal, Orissa and Bombay. Whatever the reasons which inspire this feeling, the fact that it exists among more than a fourth of the BDOs is a matter of concern.

The block level subject-matter specialists

The block pattern envisages the establishment of a team consisting of specialists in agriculture, animal husbandry, social education, co-operation and panchayats, health and sanitation and works. The points considered in this study regarding these specialists were :

(i) whether the block has been actually made the unit for establishing such teams;

(ii) the shortages and turn-over in different fields;

(iii) the personal characteristics of the block specialists.

The general position has been analysed for all fields, but a detailed analysis has been given only for the block level specialists in agriculture.

Only 74 out of the 82 blocks have sanctioned posts of an agricultural specialist under the block set-up. As two large blocks in Bombay have got 2 posts each, the total number of sanctioned posts is 76. As against this, 73 specialists have been posted in 71 blocks. Among these 71 blocks, 42 blocks have, in addition, a departmental agricultural specialist. But in only 19 of these is his jurisdiction coterminous with the block, and in the remaining 23 it is larger. Among the 11 blocks which do not have block level specialists, 6 have departmental specialists having the block as their jurisdiction, 3 have such specialists with jurisdiction larger than the blocks, and 2 blocks, one each in Madhya Pradesh and Madras, have neither block nor departmental specialist in position. The field-wise position is as follows :—

Particulars	No. of blocks having Extension Specialists							
	Agri-culture	Animal Husb-andry	Coop-eration	Panch-ayats	Public Health		Social edu-cation	
					Sanitary Inspector	Medical Officer	Male	Femal
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(i) Block specialist sanctioned.	74	46	69	16	30	27	81	62
(ii) Block specialist posted.	71	31	64	14	24	14	79	50

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(iii) Departmental specialist posted.	42	45	46	30	51	23	1	..
(iv) Block specialist only.	38	18	34	9	12	11	79	50
(v) Departmental specialist only.	9	32	16	25	39	20	1	..
(vi) Both block & deptl. specialists.	33	13	30	5	12	3	..	..
(vii) No specialist.	2	19	2	43	19	48	2	32
(viii) Departmental specialist—								
(a) Area coterminous with the block.	19	21	31	13	29	19	1	..
(b) Area not coterminous (generally larger) with the block.	23	24	15	17	22	4	..	..

It will be seen that in the field of animal husbandry only about half the blocks have been sanctioned a post of block level specialist and the number of blocks in which such specialists have been actually posted is only 31 or about 40% of the total. The block specialist is expected to be in addition to the departmental specialists who is generally available for attending to the veterinary dispensary. But even if the two are taken together, the average is less than 1 per block and there are 19 blocks which have neither the block nor the departmental specialist.

As regards co-operation and panchayats, the original block pattern had provided for only 1 specialist for both the fields. However, a number of States which had separate inspector level staffs for both the fields even before the beginning of the programme, have retained them. The recently approved changes in the staffing pattern of the block provide for separate specialists in both these fields. In the summary table given above as well as in the detailed tables the block specialist has been shown under co-operation alone and a panchayat specialist has been shown only in blocks where there is a separate functionary for panchayats.

But even if these specialists were available full-time for co-operation and the departmental co-operation specialist were added, the number of such specialists would be only 1·2 per block. In the field of social education the position is comparatively better. Practically all the blocks have sanctioned posts of male SEOs and a total of 93 such functionaries have been posted. Female SEOs have, how-

ever, been posted in only 50 blocks. A number of blocks which could not fill up the post of female SEO have posted an additional male SEO instead.

The availability of specialists, both block and departmental, in relation to the population is shown in the following table.

Sl. No.	Specialists		C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1	Agriculture	A	1·2	1·3	1·3
		B	61·8	56·7	59·0
2	Animal Husbandry	A	0·9	0·7	0·8
		B	87·0	103·7	95·3
3	Public Health	A	1·2	0·7	0·9
		B	68·2	100·6	82·6
4	Cooperation	A	1·4	1·2	1·2
		B	57·4	61·5	59·3
5	Panchayat	A	0·4	0·5	0·4
		B	191·9	158·0	171·9
6	Engineering	A	1·1	0·8	0·9
		B	73·5	85·1	79·7
7	Social Education (Male)	A	1·1	1·2	1·2
		B	70·8	60·3	64·7
8	Social Education (Female)	A	0·9	0·4	0·6
		B	88·5	184·4	123·0

A—No. per block.

B—Population (in 000's) per specialist.

This table shows that on an average there is one agricultural specialist for a population of 59,000*. In the field of animal husbandry the population per specialist is somewhat over 95,000. It has been explained above that wherever common specialists for co-operation and panchayats exist, these have been tabulated under co-operation. This should be kept in mind when interpreting figures for co-operation and panchayats.

This table presents a good picture of the size of the populations which the different specialists are expected to serve. The figures are a measure of the adequacy of the staff. It would be no exaggeration to say that one of the major determinants of progress in future would be the speed with which the ratios between the specialist staff of the block and the populations they serve can be improved.

Shortage of specialists:

The shortage of block level specialists has continued to be a problem since the beginning of the programme because while training facilities have been considerably expanded in most fields, the

*Assuming the ratio of cultivators in the general population to be 60% and further assuming an average cultivating household to consist of 5 persons, this gives a figure of one agricultural graduate for about 7000 cultivator households.

number of blocks has also increased at a rapid pace. Data on the extent of shortages in different fields are given below :—

Extension Specialist	NES—46 blocks			CD—30 blocks					
				Since first inauguration			In the present phase		
	No. of blocks reporting shortages	Average period of shortage per reporting block		No. of blocks reporting shortages	Average period of shortage per reporting block		No. of blocks reporting shortages.	Average period of shortage per reporting block	
		Yrs.	Mths.		Yrs.	Mths.		Yrs.	Mths.
1. Agriculture . .	23	0	5	23		10	16	0	6
2. Animal Husbandry .	16	1	0	17	1	3	10	1	4
3 Public Health . .	17	0	7	10	1	1	13	0	11
4. Cooperatives . .	11	0	5	19	1	1	11	0	10
5. Social Education (Male)	30	0	7	26	0	7	7	0	6
6. Social Education (Female)	20	1	0	24	1	6	16	0	7

46. out of 82 blocks have been handicapped by a shortage of specialists in agriculture for sometime. The number is equally divided between NES and CD blocks. In the case of the NES blocks the average period of shortage is 5 months and in that of CD blocks it is 10 months. In both the cases, the duration is about 1/4th of the total duration of the block. As regards inter-State variations, the number of blocks reporting shortage is particularly high in Bombay, Madhya Pradesh and U.P. In Bombay, 5 out of the 6 CD blocks studied reported shortage and the average period of the shortage was 1 year and 3 months. Because of the seasonal nature of agricultural activity the specialist should be in position at the proper time. In most parts of the country, the Kharif crop is the most important, and the specialist must join one or two months before the season begins, if he is to be really useful. Reports have been received from the PEOs that in some of the blocks the agricultural specialist was not at his post at the right time. The shortage is even more serious in the field of animal husbandry. The number of blocks reporting the shortage is quite high even when considering only those which have had posts of specialists sanctioned. The average period of the shortage is also very high. It will also be seen that the shortage of female SEOs has persisted over long periods.

Data on turn-over, training, background and attitude towards a job are given only for the agricultural specialist. As regards turnover, it will be seen from the following figures that 9 out of the 30 reporting CD blocks are having the same specialist since inauguration and another 12 have their second specialist. Practically all

the reporting NES blocks have their first or second specialist. The turn-over of these specialists is less than that of the BDOs and does not constitute a serious problem.

Order of the present Agriculture Officer	No. of Blocks		
	CD		
	Since inauguration	In the present phase	NES
1	9	18	20
2	12	10	14
3	3	2	2
4	6	1	...
	30	31	36

Moreover, as will be seen from table 3, nearly all the agricultural specialists posted in the blocks satisfy the prescribed qualifications. They have had also fair experience; extending on an average to more than 6 years, of which 2 years and 2 months had been spent on community development and NES work. However, about 20% of the specialists did not receive the orientation prescribed for them. As regards the attitude to their job, the great majority of the agricultural specialists do not consider their post in the block as a promotion or demotion. This is to be expected since the block job carries the same duties and status as the corresponding post of an agricultural inspector in the Department. But the majority of the specialists feel that there is scope for creative work in the block. It may be added that the majority of the BDOs are also satisfied with the technical qualifications of their agricultural specialists, but about 20% of them feel that they do not have an aptitude for extension work.

Finance

Under-budgeting

The present block pattern envisages an expenditure of Rs. 4·0 lakhs for an NES block and Rs. 12·0 lakhs for a CD block. The corresponding figures for blocks started before April, 1956 were Rs. 4·5 lakhs and Rs. 15·0 lakhs respectively. However, the actual budgets of the blocks do not strictly follow these patterns, and show variations which are at times quite considerable. The averages for the blocks included in this study are Rs. 4·63 lakhs for the NES blocks and Rs. 12·73 lakhs for the CD blocks. Variations from the prescribed pattern are due to several factors of which one is the

difference in the population of the differnt blocks. The relation between populations and budgets of the blocks is brought out by the following figures which show budgets of CD and NES blocks classified by population.

(Figures in Rs. lakhs)

Population Group	C.D.			N.E.S.		
	No. of blocks	Average budget per block	Budget provision as per norm of 66,000 population	No. of blocks	Average budget per block	Budget provision as per norm of 66,000 population
Below 66,000 . .	12	11.22	14.78	15	4.74	6.78
66,000—100,000 .	17	12.01*	10.22	28	4.54†	3.72
100,000—150,000 .	6	14.15*	7.54	2	6.25	3.69
Above 150,000 . .	1	34.85	12.51	1	6.23	2.57
TOTAL . .	36	12.73	10.79	46	4.63	4.23

*Information not available for two blocks.
†Information not available for one block.

It will be seen that even though blocks with larger populations have larger budgets, the increase is generally much less than in proportion to the increase in population. In case of the CD blocks, those with populations below 66,000 have an average budget of 11·22 lakhs. Brought on a standard 66,000 population basis, this works out to an average of Rs. 14·8 lakhs per block. All the CD blocks included in this study are 3 years old or more and should have a budget of Rs. 15 lakhs; so this figure is slightly below the pattern figure. But even if Rs. 12 lakhs is regarded as the operating figure, these blocks are not necessarily receiving more than their due allotment of funds. Included among them are a number of blocks, (4) in tribal, mountainous and other areas where the population per block should be considerably smaller than 66,000.

The phenomenon of under-budgeting is more clearly brought out in the more populous blocks. Thus, six blocks with populations ranging between 1 and 1½ lakhs have an average budget provision of Rs. 14·15 lakhs which works out to only Rs. 7·54 lakhs on a 66,000 population basis. This means that C.D. blocks of this category have received on an average only 63% of the allotment of funds, which they are entitled to under the present 12 lakhs pattern and only 50% of that entitled to under the former 15 lakhs pattern. Similarly under-budgeting is to be seen in the N.E.S. blocks. The least populous (below 66,000 population) blocks have undoubtedly an average allotment of Rs. 6·78 lakhs per 66,000 persons. But the reason for this has been explained above. In all other categories, the figures of budget

allotment per 66,000 persons are lower than Rs. 4 lakhs and in the one most populous block (with population more than 1½ lakhs) it is only 2·57 lakhs.

Expenditure:

Figures on expenditure incurred in the NES and CD blocks are given in Table 6. The average expenditure in an NES block from the beginning of the block till the end of September, 1957 amounted to Rs. 1·72 lakhs. Since an average block has been in operation for 1 year and 9 months, this works out to an annual average of about Rs. 1 lakh. In case of the CD blocks, the corresponding figures are 5·73 and 1·55 lakhs. In case of most of the blocks, both CD and NES, the expenditure figures are considerably lower than what they should be considering the length of operation of the block. Details of the expenditure incurred by the CD and NES blocks of different duration are shown below.

(Rs. 000's)

Duration of block	CD				NES			
	No. of blocks	Av. Budget per block	Av. Exp. per block	% of Col. 4 to Col. 3	No. of blocks	Av. Budget per block	Av. Exp. per block	% of Col. 8 to Col. 7
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Less than 1 year	...	...	...	...	1	310.0	35.1	8.6
1-2 years . .	...	...	...	...	25*	413.3	97.0	23.5
2-3 years . .	...	...	...	...	15	503.0	217.5	43.2
3-4 years . .	18*	1171.0	435.5	37.2	5	584.7	451.6	77.2
4-5 years . .	18	1364.2	694.3	50.9	...	...	...	...
	36*	1273·3	572.8	45.0	46*	463.3	177.0	38.2

*Data not available for two blocks.

It will be seen that in the 23 NES blocks which have been in operation for a period of 1 to 2 years (average about 15 months), only 23% of the budget provision has been spent. In the next category of blocks which have been in operation for 2 to 3 years, the percentage of expenditure to budget is only 43.

The financial performance of the CD blocks is not much better. Blocks which are running in the fourth year have incurred a little more than 1/3rd (37·2%) of their total expenditure and those which have completed 4 years of working and have about a year (somewhat less or more depending upon when they were converted to C.D.) to go before they revert to the PIP phase, *only* 51% *of the budget has*

been spent. Shortfalls in expenditure had been specially heavy in the first two years of the first community projects and had been commented upon in the earlier Evaluation Reports. The situation has undoubtedly shown some improvement since, but it will be seen that shortfalls still continue to be a serious problem of the programme.

As a result partly of under-budgeting but more of shortfalls in expenditure, the actual expenditure *per capita* is much less than that visualised in the pattern. The latter envisages an expenditure of Rs. 4 lakhs for three years for a population of 66,000 in the NES blocks *i.e.* an average of Rs. 2 *per capita* per year. If it is assumed that an average CD block has a period of 5 years—3 as CD and 2 as NES—the pattern provides for an expenditure of Rs. 3·6 *per capita* per year for the combined NES and CD phases. The actual *per capita* expenditures for the blocks of this study are as follows :—

Blocks: Type and duration	Number	Per capita expenditure (in Rs.) per year
NES		
Less than one year	1	0.5
1—2 years	25	1.1
2—3 years	15	1.4
3—4 years	5	1.9
TOTAL	46	1.4
CD		
3—4 years	18	1.9
4 years & above*	18	2.0
TOTAL	36	2.0

(*All 48 months old)

Thus, the rate of expenditure is on an average about 70% of that envisaged in the pattern in case of NES blocks and about 55% in case of C.D. blocks. These figures show also that shortfalls in expenditure are largely independent of the size of the block budget and continue to be nearly as serious in the NES blocks whose budget is extremely modest as they are in the CD blocks which have larger budgets.

In the course of the study, the BDOs' views on the causes of shortfalls in expenditure as also on the adequacy of block budgets were obtained. The results are as follows :—

Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	TOTAL
No. of B.D.O. returns received		35	46	81
No. of B.D.S. reporting that—				
i. Delay in budget sanction impeded the progress of work	Yes	9	16	25
	No.	24	30	54

allotment per 66,000 persons are lower than Rs. 4 lakhs and in the one most populous block (with population more than 1½ lakhs) it is only 2·57 lakhs.

Expenditure:

Figures on expenditure incurred in the NES and CD blocks are given in Table 6. The average expenditure in an NES block from the beginning of the block till the end of September, 1957 amounted to Rs. 1·72 lakhs. Since an average block has been in operation for 1 year and 9 months, this works out to an annual average of about Rs. 1 lakh. In case of the CD blocks, the corresponding figures are 5·73 and 1·55 lakhs. In case of most of the blocks, both CD and NES, the expenditure figures are considerably lower than what they should be considering the length of operation of the block. Details of the expenditure incurred by the CD and NES blocks of different duration are shown below.

(Rs. 000's)

Duration of block	CD				NES			
	No. of blocks	Av. Budget per block	Av. Exp. per block	% of Col. 4 to Col. 3	No. of blocks	Av. Budget per block	Av. Exp. per block	% of Col. 8 to Col. 7
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Less than 1 year	...	...	...	...	1	310.0	35.1	8.6
1-2 years	...	...	...	...	25*	413.3	97.0	23.5
2-3 years	...	...	...	...	15	503.0	217.5	43.2
3-4 years	18*	1171.0	435.5	37.2	5	584.7	451.6	77.2
4-5 years	18	1364.2	694.3	50.9	...	...	...	...
	36*	1273·3	572.8	45.0	46*	463.3	177.0	38.2

*Data not available for two blocks.

It will be seen that in the 23 NES blocks which have been in operation for a period of 1 to 2 years (average about 15 months), only 23% of the budget provision has been spent. In the next category of blocks which have been in operation for 2 to 3 years, the percentage of expenditure to budget is only 43.

The financial performance of the CD blocks is not much better. Blocks which are running in the fourth year have incurred a little more than 1/3rd (37·2%) of their total expenditure and those which have completed 4 years of working and have about a year (somewhat less or more depending upon when they were converted to C.D.) to go before they revert to the PIP phase, *only 51% of the budget has*

been spent. Shortfalls in expenditure had been specially heavy in the first two years of the first community projects and had been commented upon in the earlier Evaluation Reports. The situation has undoubtedly shown some improvement since, but it will be seen that shortfalls still continue to be a serious problem of the programme.

As a result partly of under-budgeting but more of shortfalls in expenditure, the actual expenditure *per capita* is much less than that visualised in the pattern. The latter envisages an expenditure of Rs. 4 lakhs for three years for a population of 66,000 in the NES blocks *i.e.* an average of Rs. 2 *per capita* per year. If it is assumed that an average CD block has a period of 5 years—3 as CD and 2 as NES—the pattern provides for an expenditure of Rs. 3·6 *per capita* per year for the combined NES and CD phases. The actual *per capita* expenditures for the blocks of this study are as follows :—

Blocks: Type and duration	Number	Per capita expenditure (in Rs.) per year
NES		
Less than one year	1	0.5
1—2 years	25	1.1
2—3 years	15	1.4
3—4 years	5	1.9
TOTAL	46	1.4
CD		
3—4 years	18	1.9
4 years & above*	18	2.0
TOTAL	36	2.0

(*All 48 months old)

Thus, the rate of expenditure is on an average about 70% of that envisaged in the pattern in case of NES blocks and about 55% in case of C.D. blocks. These figures show also that shortfalls in expenditure are largely independent of the size of the block budget and continue to be nearly as serious in the NES blocks whose budget is extremely modest as they are in the CD blocks which have larger budgets.

In the course of the study, the BDOs' views on the causes of shortfalls in expenditure as also on the adequacy of block budgets were obtained. The results are as follows :—

Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	TOTAL
No. of B.D.O. returns received		35	46	81
No. of B.D.S. reporting that—				
i. Delay in budget sanction impeded the progress of work	Yes	9	16	25
	No.	24	30	54

Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	TOTAL
ii. Other procedural delays retarded progress.	(Yes	20	21	41
	(No.	15	23	38
iii. Staff can be more fruitfully employed if more funds are available.	(Yes	14	24	38
	(No.	16	21	37
VLWs can be more fruitfully employed		4	5	9
iv. Loans & subsidies are being made available too freely.	(Yes	8	3	11
	(No.	26	43	69
v. Block staff have departmental funds to spend.	(Yes	27	22	49
	(No.	8	24	32

25 out of the 81 reporting BDOs or nearly a third of the total stated that delays in sanction of budgets impeded progress of work. But the number of those reporting retarded progress due to other procedural delays was as high as 41. Thus a large number of BDOs feel that delays in giving sanctions and other procedural delays are a serious impediment to progress of the programme. As regards the adequacy of the block budgets, 38 BDOs feel that the block staff could be more fruitfully employed if they had more funds. The numbers for C.D. and NES blocks are 14 and 24 respectively indicating that the feeling is much more widespread among the BDOs of NES blocks who have much smaller funds to spend. This feeling prevails even though in as many as 49 blocks some departmental funds are also being spent by the block staff. On the other hand, only 11 out of 81 BDOs feel that loans and subsidies are being made available too freely.

People's participation:

Figures on people's participation have also been tabulated by CD and N.E.S. blocks and by duration of blocks. The value of participation (all types) works out to an average of Rs. 1·29 lakhs for an NES block and Rs. 5·4 lakhs for a C.D. block (Table 6). The figures of people's participation expressed as percentages of block expenditure for C.D. and N.E.S. blocks and by duration of block are given below :—

Duration of block	C.D.		N.E.S.	
	No. of blocks	% of people's contribution to total expenditure	No. of blocks	% of people's contribution to total expenditure
Less than 1 year	...	...	1	Nil
1—2 years	...	...	25*	74.6
2—3 years	...	...	15	96.2
3—4 years	18	120.0**	5	42.9
4—5 years	18	69.1	...	...
TOTAL	36	85.5	46	75.6

* Data n.a. for two blocks.
**Data n.a. for four blocks.

The proportion of people's participation to block expenditure has a tendency to decline in the later years of both the N.E.S. and the C.D. blocks. Among the NES blocks, the percentage is highest in those which are in their third year and among the CD blocks in those which are in the fourth year. However, too much importance cannot be given to this percentage figure. It is a ratio which is influenced not only by the quantum of people's participation but also by that of block expenditure. One reason for the percentage of people's contribution to block expenditure falling towards the end is that the block expenditure is very low in the first or second years and picks up rather rapidly later. The more significant figures therefore are those of the absolute value of popular participation itself. These are given below :—

	CD			N.E.S.				
Duration of block	3-4 years	4-5 years	Total	Less than 1 year	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	Total
No. of relevant blocks.	16	18	34	1	24	15	4	44
Average people's contribution per 1000 persons per year (in Rs.).	244.8	1411.8	1822.8	Nil	852.1	1304.1	862.8	1041.6

It will be seen that the value of people's participation is on an average about 80% higher in the CD than in the NES blocks. The larger budget of the CD block obviously affords much greater scope for obtaining people's participation for community works and other activities. These figures also show a decline in popular participation towards the closing phases of both CD and NES blocks. This decline seems to indicate that the possibilities of mobilisation of popular effort are inadequately utilised. The succeeding years of a block should result in progressively larger mobilisation of popular participation as the results of the educational effort of the block staff as also the radiational influence of the work done in earlier years begin to produce their effect. But if the figures instead of progressively increasing show a decline towards the end, it only means that benefits from the educational effort and radiational effect are not being obtained. The reasons for fall in popular participation deserve to be carefully investigated. These may be found in the waning of enthusiasm of the block staff or of the people in block activities. This is sometimes alleged. They may more frequently be found connected with budgetary patterns which do not provide for adequate increases in later years for items for which popular participation could be utilised. The reason is certainly not to be found in the people's demand for such facilities having been fully or largely satisfied. This explanation, which is sometimes advanced, shows an insufficient understanding of the rural situation. The process of providing even the most elementary facilities in health, education, communications, etc., has just begun and there can be no question of rural people not wanting these facilities in increasing measure, and not contributing to them to the extent of their capacity provided proper extension methods are adopted and the contributions demanded from them are within their capacity.

Activities

Data on various activities in the blocks were collected by the Project Evaluation Officers in the course of this enquiry and selected figures relating to particular activities have been given in appropriate places. However, it has not been considered necessary to give detailed tables listing individual block activities as it was felt that this would merely duplicate the figures which are otherwise readily available. The section begins with a discussion of what the BDOs consider their most important achievements. The major part of the section is devoted to a discussion of the agricultural programme. This includes quantitative assessment of the programme in individual blocks. The activities in four other fields—animal husbandry, public health and sanitation, co-operation and panchayats have been commented on very briefly. In the end, there is a discussion of the programmes for the underprivileged groups. This last part is based on data collected by P. E. Os. in the five selected villages.

Each BDO was asked to indicate in order of importance eight achievements from all fields of activity. He was later asked to list the first three achievements in each important field. These figures give the judgment of these key officers on what they have been able to achieve during the block period and are, therefore, of great value as indicators of the general orientation of the block programmes.

Important Achievements of the Block (Table 7)

76 out of the 82 Block Development Officers listed their first eight achievements. The items listed by them include all the important items which are associated with the programme. Agricultural items and the construction items—drinking water wells, roads, school buildings, etc. appear most prominently in these lists.

It will be seen that 31 out of the 76 reporting B. D. Os list some agricultural item or other as the most important activity. Propagation of improved seed occupies the highest place; it is considered to be the most important achievement in 13 blocks and figures among the first eight items in 38 blocks. The next place is claimed by 'construction of roads and culverts' which is reported as the first activity in 11 blocks and among the first eight in 47 blocks. Construction of drinking water wells and of school buildings come next. They occupy the first place in 6 and 4 blocks respectively, but are among the first eight in 40 and 30 blocks respectively. Items like pavement of streets have limited application because of their suitability to particular regional conditions, and are reported as important in a few blocks. It is noteworthy, that activities connected with social education like youth clubs, women's clubs, adult literacy centres and community centres rank low. These occupy the first place in only one block and with the exception of community centres, figure insignificant among the first eight. The performance is, therefore, much below the expectation, raised by the relative emphasis on this part of the programme. The figures for panchayats are pretty low. No Block Development Officer has listed strengthening of panchayats as his most important activity and only 5 have listed this as one of their eight important achievements. Establishment of co-operatives is considered as the top achievement by 4 BDOs while 35 list it among the first eight. On the other hand panchayats and co-operatives are expected to provide

the two most important bases for the programme. That these institutions occupy the back seats in most cases is due in part to the fact that in a number of blocks the BDOs have not been directly concerned with panchayat work and they do not regard this as their special responsibility, and also that the block pattern does not as yet provide independent block level specialists in this field.

Agriculture (Tables 8 to 11)

As might be expected propagation of improved seed, of chemical fertilizers and of the Japanese method of paddy cultivation are the most important activities in this field. Among these, propagation of improved seed is reported to be the most important achievement in the field of agriculture by more than one third of the BDOs (29 out of 81); but the number reporting it as one of the first three achievements is as high as 52. Chemical fertilizer is reported among the first three achievements by an even larger number of BDOs (56) but the number reporting it as the most important achievement in this field is considerably lower. The Japanese method of paddy cultivation is reported from a fewer number of blocks mainly because its application is limited to the paddy growing areas; but where it is reported, it is ranked very high. Of the 21 BDOs who reported this among their first three achievements, 13 report it as the most important.

In contrast to these items which involve improvement in agricultural practices land improvement items are much less important. Among these, minor irrigation alone is of some importance. It is included among the first three achievements of the block in 16 cases, but ranks as the most important achievement in only 8. These figures are somewhat surprising in view of the importance of minor irrigation for agricultural improvement in most parts of the country the fact being that substantial funds have been provided for this activity in the CD phase and that considerable non-block funds have also been available for this activity. It may also be added in passing that the proportion of NES blocks listing minor irrigation among their first three achievements is higher than that of CD blocks.

The other land improvement items hardly figure in this table. There is little or no activity in respect of these items in a large number of blocks. Thus, land reclamation is undertaken in 34 blocks but it is considered important enough to be included among the first three achievements of the blocks in only 2. The corresponding figures for soil conservation are 13 and 1 and for consolidation of holdings 11 and 0.

Activity in land improvement items other than irrigation is not widespread or important even on non-project account. This is well brought out from the replies of BDOs and DAOs on the main non-project agricultural inputs in Table 9. Most of them have listed supply of seed, fertilizers and pesticides, which are arranged by the Department of Agriculture, as the most important non-project inputs. Minor irrigation has been mentioned by 26 BDOs (about 1/3rd of the total) and large scale irrigation by 9. Land reclamation and soil conservation have been mentioned by only 5 and 2

BDOs respectively. It is clear from all these figures that the contribution of land improvement items to the agricultural improvement effort is as yet inadequate.

Improvement of agriculture has been considered to be one of the most important objectives of this programme from the beginning and the point was re-emphasised in 1956 when the Planning Commission again requested the State Governments to give greater attention to agricultural improvement programmes in the block areas. As a result of this and the realisation that marked increase in agricultural production is essential for the success of the Second Plan, the State Governments have asked the block staff within the last two years to give increasing attention to programmes for improving agricultural production. The extent to which the BDOs and DAOs feel that these programmes are in fact receiving greater attention is shown in Table 9. The limitation of the figures should be kept in mind. Since this is an important official policy, every BDO would like to say that he is following it and he would report otherwise only where he is convinced that due to circumstances beyond his control this is not being done. The DAO, on the other hand, is not under such compulsion and as the block staff is not under his control, there might be a tendency to under-estimate the efforts which they are making in this field. It will be seen from these figures that nearly all the BDOs feel that the Gram Sevaks are paying greater attention to the agricultural programme. But among the DAOs, opinion seems to be equally divided between those who feel that Gram Sevaks are paying greater attention to agriculture and those who feel otherwise. But the majority of both BDOs and DAOs feel that even greater attention should be given to this work, indicating that there is room for considerable improvement in this respect.

Improved Seed

The role of the block agency consists in popularising improved varieties through field demonstrations and other ways and arranging supplies and distribution. In certain cases where other sources of distribution are not developed the Gram Sevaks themselves underake the physical distribution. Details of the work done in this field are shown in Table 10.

The figures are given separately for four important crops, paddy, wheat, cotton and sugarcane. As these figures show, some activity either by way of introducing new varieties of seed or of spreading the use of varieties already in use in the block, has been undertaken in all blocks. However, these activities are not enough ; the supply of improved seeds should be greatly augmented, local sources of supply should be established, and the channels of distribution improved. The Second Five Year Plan accordingly, laid down the objective of establishing one seed farm in every block. But, progress in this respect has not been as rapid as expected ; only 24 of the 82 blocks studied by us have established seed farms so far, and the number of blocks reporting the existence of some seed multiplication schemes in operation is 55. Activity in respect of increasing outlets for the distribution of seeds, fertilizers and other agricultural supplies has been reported from most blocks. On an average a block had about 4½ such outlets at the time of the study. If the number of those which distribute seeds only and seeds and fertili-

comparable data for the A.P.E. were available only for cotton drill. The households adopting these two items constituted about 22% of the relevant households at the time of A.P.R. In the case of cotton drill, there was an increase of 72% since the A.P.E. This implement is also more readily accepted now; the proportion of households adopting without facility rose from 20% at A.P.E. to 38% at the A.P.R. However, by the time of the A.P.R. the cotton drill had been sponsored in 5 villages in two blocks only, *viz.*, Batala (Punjab) and Erode (Madras), while cotton seed had been sponsored in 29 villages and line sowing and cotton seed in 16. One would think that these interrelated programmes should have been introduced, more or less, simultaneously in the villages.

At the A.P.R., reversion was reported more often in the case of the cotton drill than of the improved plough, the figures being 14 and 4 per cent. respectively. The reasons for non-adoption and reversion are given below :—

Items	Reasons		
	Lack of conviction of the superiority of implements	Lack of financial resources	Lack of other resources
1	2	3	4
Improved plough	16.6	11.5	23.3
Cotton drill	26.4	18.9	0.0

For improved plough, 'lack of other resources' is given as the most important reasons for reversion and non-adoption. 20% of households have reported shortage of bullock power and only about 3%, shortage of land. In the case of cotton drill, 'lack of conviction of the superiority of implements' is most often reported. 'Lack of financial resources' is reported in two-third as many cases as lack of conviction.

6. *Pesticides*

Detailed information was collected for two pesticides only, *viz.*, gammaxene and agroson. The enquiry reveals that even though adoption has moved forward significantly since the A.P.E., the extent of adoption is still very low. Only about 14% of the relevant households have adopted gammaxene and 7% agroson. Facilities seem clearly to have contributed to the adoption of these items. 74% of the adopting households have taken to the use of agroson with facility while 62% have done so in the case of gammaxene. But the new ground does not appear to have been conquered firmly. The percentage of the adopting households which are satisfied does not seem to have increased significantly between the two enquiries. Moreover, only 39% and 24% of the households which have adopted agroson and gammaxene respectively with facility are willing to continue even if the facility is withdrawn. Analysis of the reasons for

reversion and non-adoption of gammaxene shows that 53% of the reverting households and 29% of those which did not adopt are not convinced of its utility. Agroson is not easily available and this has obliged a good number of the adopting households to give up its use. 32% of the reverting households complain of difficulty in getting agroson while 16% are not convinced of its utility.

People's Participation

One of the basic objectives of the programme is to make it a people's movement in the true sense. People's participation is, therefore, a very significant measure of the degree to which this objective is being achieved. To this end, the A.P.R. enquiry collected data on people's contribution to the construction of roads and school buildings and their participation in rural institutions.

The A.P.R. data are compared with those of the B.M.S. as the A.P.E. did not contain information on the amount of contribution. The data in both instances, refer to the activities during the year preceding the enquiry. The B.M.S. sample also includes non-cultivators. But for the present study, these have been excluded and only the information relating to cultivators have been utilised for comparison with those of the A.P.R. The larger B.M.S. sample has been used; only one centre Theog (Himachal Pradesh) which was not common to both the enquiries has been excluded.

The table below gives the number of villages covered by different works programmes, the percentage of households participating in the works and the percentage of participating households to total households in the covered villages.

Items	No. of villages covered		Percentage of participating households to all households in the sample		Percentage of participating households to all households in the covered villages in the sample	
	A.P.R.	B.M.S.	A.P.R.	B.M.S.	A.P.R.	B.M.S.
1	2	3	4	5	6*	7*
Roads	26	56	20.9	31.2	59.2	46.7
School buildings	18	36	8.4	8.5	35.8	11.5
Drinking water wells	7	N.A.	3.2	N.A.	36.6	N.A.
Any work	..	..	36.1	43.9	55.9	23.1

*Figures in cols. 6 and 7 relate to all households in the villages where the particular works programme was taken up.

A household is said to be participating in a work, if it contributes cash, labour or other materials to its execution. In interpreting the data it should be borne in mind that the A.P.R. and the B.M.S. samples are made up of the same villages. Some of these villages had roads built at the time of the B.M.S., so that the villages in which road building activity was likely to be found at the time of the A.P.R. would be smaller in number. This argument is still more true of the school building activity. Indeed, the index of people's participation in items like roads and school buildings should refer to their extension to new villages as well as to their development within the same village. Data relating to the latter alone do not tell the full story.

The percentage of households participating in road construction to all households in the sample (cols. 4 & 5) declined between the two enquiries. This is wholly due to the fact that the number of villages in which roads were built during the year prior to the A.P.R. was less than that for the B.M.S. On the other hand, as cols. 6 & 7 show, in the villages in which road construction was taken up in the later period, much larger percentages of the village population took part in the programme. In the case of school building, the percentage of participating to all households remained, more or less, constant in spite of a decline of 50% in the number of villages where the activity took place. This is due to the three-fold increase in the proportion of households in the relevant villages which participated. As regards drinking water wells, the percentage of participating villagers in the villages where they were constructed, was slightly higher than for school buildings, but much lower than for road construction.

It would seem, therefore, that while progress measured in terms of the numbers of villages participating in the construction of roads and school buildings has gone down, the proportion of households in the villages in which these activities took place increased substantially.

Participation is highest in the case of roads. It seems that roads are regarded as a common necessity by more households in the villages than schools and drinking water wells. Besides, road construction is a project to which more people can contribute by way of labour —the form in which the contribution comes from the largest proportion of the villagers. In 6 out of the nine blocks in which the work was done, the percentage of participating households to the total households in the covered villages ranged from 54% to 97%. The high level of participation is brought out more clearly by the distribution of blocks by percentage of participating households to all households in the sample. This is given below.

Item	Number of blocks wherein participation ranged between					
	50 to 100%	25 to 50%	10 to 25%	Below 10%	Nil	Not sponsored
Roads	2	2	2	3	1	4
School Buildings	Nil	1	4	3	1	5
Drinking water wells	Nil	Nil	2	2	1	9

Nature of Contribution.

It is not enough to examine the extent of participaiton in terms of the number of participating households. This should be supplemented by a study of the nature of their contribution *i.e.*, to say, in cash, labour or in other ways. The relevant data are given below.

Items	Percentage of participating households contributing				Contribution per contributing household			
	Cash		Labour		Cash (Rs.)		Labour (man-days)	
	A.P.R.	B.M.S.	A.P.R.	B.M.S.	A.P.R.	B.M.S.	A.P.R.	B.M.S.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Roads . .	3·4	13·5	97·2	92·4	8·3	7·7	5·4	8·2
School Buildings .	60·6	79·4	40·0	32·8	15·2	15·5	7·3	7·7
Drinking water wells	44·1	N.A.	76·3	N.A.	17·3	N.A.	5·7	N.A.
Any work	34·7	31·8*	71·9	80·3*	14·7	11·2*	7·3	8·1*

*Figures based on all households including non-cultivators and not on cultivators only as elsewhere.

N.A. Not Available.

The table shows that both at the B.M.S. and A.P.R. much higher percentages of the contributing households made their contribution in labour than in cash for the construction of roads and drinking water wells. The converse holds for school buildings.

The percentages of households contributing labour have gone up in the case of roads and school buildings. On the other hand, the labour time contributed per household and per contributing household has gone down for all works, substantially for roads. As between holdings of different sizes, the contribution of the lower groups to all works has gone down, while that of the higher ones has gone up. The detailed figures are given below.

Cultivated holding size groups	Labour contribution (man-days)		
	Per 100 persons		Per contributing household*
	A.P.R.	B.M.S.	A.P.R.
Below 2 acres	26·1	73·3	4·5
2—5 acres	32·8	58·6	5·8
5—10 acres	17·6	49·1	5·9
10—25 acres	35·5	31·4	13·7
25 acres & above	34·1	21·4	18·3
All sizes	29·2	51·4	7·1†

* Data for B.M.S. not available.

† Includes Theog.

It is possible that the larger holdings are making their conribution through hired labour. Data on family size show that the larger holdings do not have proportionately larger numbers of persons in the family—land per capita is larger for the higher size of holdings.

The contribution in cash has remained more or less, the same whether we estimate it in terms of contributing households or persons and, as one would expect, the households with the larger holdings have made relatively higher contribution as shown below :—

Size group	Cash (Rs.)		
	Per 100 persons		Per contributing household*
	A.P.R.	B.M.S.	A.P.R.
Below 2 acres	2·0	7·4	44·6
2—5 acres	4·7	16·5	5·7
5—10 acres	33·1	21·6	18·4
10—25 acres	34·3	42·3	10·7
25 acres & above	140·3	115·3	35·7
All sizes	28·6	29·1	18·0

*Data for B.M.S. not available.

Significant contribution in the form of land was reported in one block only *viz.*, Chalakudy (Kerala).

Village Institutions

In most instances institutions are necessary means for mobilising people's participation. The community development programme has, therefore, as one of its main objectives, the strengthening of popular institutions in the rural areas. Village institutions fall into two categories voluntary, like youth clubs, community centres, women's clubs. vikas mandals and statutory like village panchayats; the co-operative societies fall in between. The following table gives the data on the voluntary institutions at the A.P.R.

Institution	No. of villages covered out of 96 in the sample	Total no. of institutions	% of inactive institutions to total institutions	% of member households to total households in the relevant* villages	% of active member households to total member households
1	2	3	4	5	6
Community Centre	21	21	20	27·1	68·0
Youth Club	27	27	50	17·0	43·3
Women's Club	10	10	60	10·2	27·3
Vikas Mandal	22	22	80	9·3	27·1

*The villages where the institution exists.

The table shows that youth clubs exist in nearly 28% of the villages, and community centres and vikas mandals in about 22% while only 10% of the villages have women clubs. These are low figures.

Voluntary Institutions

But even in the villages where these institutions exist, the proportions of inactive institutions are high, except in the case of community centre. Vikas mandals are inactive in 80% of the villages. In 27% of the blocks which have community centres, the institution is completely inactive. The corresponding figure for vikas mandals is 66·6%. Again the percentage of participating households is low for all the institutions; lowest for women's clubs and vikas mandals. In some blocks only about 3% of the households in the relevant villages take any interest in the local youth clubs, women clubs and vikas mandals. Finally, except in the case of community centres, and in some measure youth clubs, the percentages of participating households which take active interest in these civic organisations are small. A comparison of the percentage figures in columns 4 and 5 shows that as the percentage of participating households increases or diminishes, the proportion of inactive institution decreases or increases; possibly an institution is more active because more people take interest in it and conversely, more people take interest in an institution if it is active. Of the four institutions dealt with above, the community centre has a better showing than the others in respect of all the criteria excepting coverage where the youth club fares better.

Panchayats

Panchayats and co-operatives are the chief institutions for rural democracy and mutual help and the extent to which the rural people participate in these institutions is of great significance to the community development programme. The panchayats have been dealt with more fully in a separate chapter, while the chapter on general evaluation contains observations on the operation of the co-operative societies. The discussion on these topics in the following pages is, therefore, confined to an examination of the membership of panchayats and of the beneficiaries of co-operative societies in terms of the size of the holdings of the households to which the participants belong and also of their occupational classification. The data from our enquiry are summarised in the following table.

Panchayats				Co-operatives			
Percentages are to total families in the cell				Percentages are to total families in the cell			
Size of holding group	% of households with panchayat members	Occupational groups	% of households with panchayat member	Size of holding group	% of households receiving benefits from co-operatives	Occupational groups	% of households receiving benefits from cooperatives
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
0—2	1.1	Cultivating owners	7·3	0—2	16.5	Cultivating owners	26.8
2—5	4.2	Cultivating tenants	2.0	2—5	25.0	Cultivating tenants	17.1

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5—10 .	9·3	Non-cultivating owners	..	5—10	28.3	Non-cultivating owners.	..
10—25 .	7·5	Agricultural labour	1·3	10—25	25·3	Agricultural labour	15·1
Above 25	14·3	Artisans . . .	..	10—15	31·3	Artisans . .	32·1
		Other Non-Agri-occupation	1·9			Other Non-Agri-occupation.	17·3
TOTAL .	5·7		5·7	TOTAL	24.0		24.0

The smaller holdings are much less represented in the panchayats than the bigger ones. In so far as membership of the panchayat is associated with leadership in the village, the former group evidently plays a less important role than the latter.

Column 4 classifies the households in our sample (which all have some land, owned or leased) in terms of their principal occupation. It would appear that in proportion to their strength in the villages, the households of cultivating owners have more representation on the panchayats than the other groups. Our study does not include the non-cultivating households; and the table given above does not contain information regarding their membership of the panchayat. It is, however, unlikely that, say, agricultural labourers without land would have a greater chance of being elected to the panchayat than the labourer who also cultivates some land, owned or leased.

Co-operatives

The benefits flowing from co-operatives include loans, agricultural supply, marketing, etc. Again the households with larger holdings are better represented among the beneficiaries than those with smaller holdings. This may be due partly to the policy of disbursing loans (which is the major benefit) being still based on the credit worthiness of the loanees. Occupation-wise, the artisans seem to be better represented among the recipients of the benefits of co-operation than other classes. But the high figure for the group is due to the figures of the two blocks—Bhathat (U.P.) and Kolhapur (Bombay)—where the percentages were above 60. The percentage of families participating in co-operative societies had gone up from 13% at the time of the B.M.S. to 32% at the A.P.R. However, two-thirds of all families still remain outside the movement. The relative representation in the co-operative movement, of the different strata of rural society, classified according to the size of holding as well as occupation is greater than in panchayat. This is more significant, since membership of a co-operative society is voluntary while every adult in the village is under the statute, entitled to vote for and seek election to the panchayat.

Rural institutions and agricultural practices do not belong to the same category. Except the co-operatives which are both economic and social in purpose, the former lie in the social and political sphere.

Advance in the social and political field, as shown by the people's participation in rural institutions, calls for revision of social values and attitudes and development of civic sense. On the other hand, the agricultural programme relates to, more or less, purely economic activity, though even here the acceptance of a new practice is influenced by social factors. Finally, peoples participation in rural institutions implies co-operation in projects, the benefits of which, except in the case of co-operative societies, accrue to all villagers, participants and non-participants, while the fruits of the agricultural programmes are reaped by the individual households which adopt them.

These general considerations may be borne in mind in comparing the relative advance made in the blocks under study in respect of the two broad sections of the community development programme. Our data suggest that the advance in regard to agricultural practices between the two enquiries was greater than in respect of peoples participation in rural institutions. There are, however, within each broad section large differences between the sub-divisions. Within the agricultural programme, improved seeds have made more progress than the other items. In the section of social co-operation, far more households have participated in the joint enterprise of road constructions than in any other programme, while village institutions present a rather sorry picture. This suggests that a good deal of thinking has to be done on the purpose, content and technique of social education.

CHAPTER IV

A STUDY OF PANCHAYATS

INTRODUCTION

Statutory panchayats have existed in some States of the country for a fairly long period. Thus, Madras, had its first panchayats in 1920. Some other States, notably Bombay and Mysore, have also had panchayats for nearly three decades. These earlier panchayats, however, covered only a limited number of villages and had generally a limited range of functions. The programme of organising panchayats on a country-wide scale can be said to have started only after Independence. It was motivated by the objectives of decentralising administration and giving the maximum initiative to the village people in the management of their own affairs and development of their own resources. The idea was incorporated in the Constitution of India as a Directive Principle of State policy :—

"The State shall take steps to organise village panchayats and endow them with such power and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as units of self government"—Article 40—Directive Principles.

However, a number of States motivated by the fundamental ideas which were later incorporated in the constitution had already taken steps for establishment of panchayats.

With the beginning of planned development, organisation of panchayats received a further stimulus. The existence of an agency at the village level which could represent the entire community, could assume responsibility and provide the necessary leadership for implementing development programmes was considered essential for progress in rural development. It was also felt that these institutions taking an active part in both planning and execution of plans should form the democratic base for planning for the country as a whole. In this connection, the following quotation from the Second Five Year Plan is of interest.

"Indeed, rural progress depends entirely on the existence of an active organisation in the village which can bring all the people—including the weaker sections mentioned above—into common programmes to be carried out with the assistance of the administration".*

Statutory provision to organise village panchayats has now been made in all States. In some States like Madras where panchayats were already in existence, legislation has been amended so as to bring the institution in line with the Directive Principles of the Constitution and the approach of the first and second Five Year Plans. A large number of States where statutory panchayats did not exist earlier, *e.g.*, Punjab, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Madhya Bharat, Orissa and Saurashtra have established such institutions during the last 10 years. Activity in this direction has been continuous and in some States, the laws passed in the post-independence period have been amended in the light of further experience of the working of the panchayats.

*Report on the Second Five Year Plan, p. 150.

However, even though some progress has been made in every State, it is still very uneven as between States. Some States like Saurashtra have established panchayats, given them liberal resources, and invested them with very wide administrative and development powers including those of collection of land revenue and maintenance of land records. At the other extreme in West Bengal, village level panchayats had not been set up till the time of this study* and Mysore and Assam had not made any appreciable progress in revitalizing their institutions. Moreover, the panchayats in different States vary very greatly in every major respect—the resources at their disposal; the encouragement given by State Governments to assume responsibilities in the field of development and administration; availability of suitable staff for guidance and inspection; as also more formal matters of jurisdiction; size and composition of the body; systems of election; election of the President; appointment of the Secretary; relation with the State Government and with higher level local bodies.

To an extent, variations in the system of panchayat in different parts of the country can be seen to be due to regional differences in economic or physical conditions. Thus, the large panchayats in Kerala appear to be related to the peculiar settlement pattern in the State. Similarly, the emphasis on one village one panchayat in the Punjab and U.P., can be related to the structure of their villages. However, there is no question that policy makers in different States have been guided by different ideas about the form, structure and functions of this institution and that Inter-State differences are due in large part to this reason.

The entire subject of the role of democratic local self government institutions including the panchayats, is under active consideration in all States at present. On the fundamental objectives of giving these institutions maximum powers for development and administration there seems unanimity of opinion. However, the form and structure of the institutions; the level at which institutions above the panchayats should be established; the relations between the democratic institutions at different levels and their relation with the administration are subjects of active thinking. The most recent example of such thinking is the report of the COPP Team on community projects and National Extension Service. This study of P.E.O. can also be considered to be a small contribution to thinking on this subject. The primary objectives of the study was to analyse the working of a selected number of panchayats in the development blocks. It brings out data on the way these institutions have functioned, what they have been able to achieve and what difficulties they have experienced.

Scope and Method of the Study

As this study was concerned primarily with the functioning of panchayats as development institutions, it did not enquire into their judicial and purely administrative functions. The study was undertaken in 15 evaluation blocks, 13 of which had been parts of the first community projects and the remaining 2 were community development blocks. It could not be undertaken, for different reasons, in the evaluation blocks of Andhra, Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan and West Bengal. The primary emphasis in the study was on the working of

*The Panchayat Act had, however, been passed in 1956.

the panchayats and their impact on the villages. However, all necessary data were obtained on the State Governments' policies in relation to panchayats. The Panchayats Acts were studied and discussions held with the officials concerned at the district and block levels and in some cases also at the State level.

In each Evaluation block, 2 to 6 panchayats depending upon the total number of panchayats in the block, were selected for study; the total number of panchayats selected for the study being 60. The sample included study of the panchayats as well as of the villages in which these institutions function. In case of multi-village panchayats which covered a large number of villages, the study was confined to the headquarter village of the panchayat and 1-2 (in rare cases 2) non-headquarter villages as it was not considered necessary to include all the villages. Thus, out of a total of 175 villages covered by these 60 panchayats. 102 were selected for study. The 73 villages which were not covered are concentrated in a few blocks, notably Cachar (Assam), Bhadrak (Orissa) and Ashta (Bhopal) where the panchayat's jurisdiction extends over a large number of villages. In most other blocks, all or most of the villages covered by the multi-village panchayats have been included in the study.

The study was conducted by the Project Evaluation Officers. Each PEO spent three to four weeks in the area of each of the panchayat studied. During the course of his stay, he had discussions with the officials and members of the panchayat, village level officials and other villagers; interviewed a carefully selected list of respondents and studied panchayat records, accounts and other materials relating to the functioning of the institution. Besides obtaining data on income and expenditure of the panchayats, he collected for each of the villages visited. detailed data on development expenditure in the village during the project period. and the contribution to it from the project, other government grants and *ad hoc* collections from the people. Further. data relating to the economic and caste composition of the population and patterns of leadership and groups and the relation between the latter and the panchayat and groups were collected for each village.

The interviews with respondents were designed primarily to assess their reaction to the functioning of the institution. The questionnaire for this interview included questions on the respondents' feeling regarding the usefulness of the panchayat, his suggestions for improving the income of the panchayat and for making the institution more effective, and whether in his opinion panchayat should have specific powers like collection of land revenue. maintenance of revenue records etc.

The respondents selected for the interview were of two kinds.

(i) knowledgeable persons like the panchayat President, members of the panchayat, candidates defeated at the last election, the panchayat Secretary, the Gram Sevak and the village patwari, *i.e.*, all persons who have knowledge of working of the institution and have a certain amount of interest in its affairs;

(ii) non-knowledgeable persons.

The number of panchayat members and defeated candidates selected for interview was limited to two per village. Similarly, the number of non-knowledgeable respondents, who were selected at random, was limited to 5 per village except in Chalakudy (Kerala) where because of the peculiar conditions of the area, the number was 15. A total of 1,080 respondents were interviewed, of which 529 were knowledgeable and 551 non-knowledgeable. The number of panchayats and villages selected and the details of the respondents interviewd for the study are given in Tables 1 and 2.

The field work for the study was done in the various centres between January and July, 1957.

As the study was conducted shortly after the Reorganisation of States, the panchayat systems to which it relates are those which had evolved before Reorganisation. Therefore in referring to States and blocks, the names of States before Reorganisation have been used*. To illustrate : Three of the selected blocks — Manavadar, Kolhapur and Morsi are in Bombay since Reorganisation. In this study, however, they have been referred to as being in Saurashtra, Bombay and Madhya Pradesh respectively. Similarly pre-Reorganisation State names like Hyderabad, Madhya Bharat and Bhopal have been used. It was felt that this was the only way to avoid confusion.

STRUCTURE OF PANCHAYATS

Size of the Panchayat Unit.

The number of panchayats and the populations covered by them in the fifteen evaluation blocks in which this study was conducted as also the number and population of those panchayats included in this study are shown in Table 1. It will be seen that the average population of all the panchayats (including both single and multi-village) in the evaluation blocks is somewhat over 1,800. The corresponding figure for the 60 panchayats included in this study is somewhat over 2,600, with the averages for single village and multi-village panchayats being 1,929 and 3,520 respectively. The average for the panchayats included in the study is higher because panchayats below a certain size were excluded from the study. There are wide interstate variations in the population covered by panchayats. In Kerala, for instance, the panchayats usually cover large populations, ranging from 5,000 to 15,000 in most cases, but going up to 30,000 in some cases. There are no villages in the usual sense in this area and the revenue 'village' which is a purely administrative unit generally has a population of 5 to 10 thousands and even more. The average population of the three panchayats in the State included in this study is above 15,000. In Madras similarly, the panchayats cover large populations because their jurisdiction generally extends over the revenue village and its attached hamlets. Other States in which the population covered by a panchayat is quite large are Assam, Orissa and Bihar. On the other hand, in Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, Bombay, Saurashtra and Madhya Pradesh the population covered by the panchayats is comparatively small. In Punjab panchayats can be formed in every village having a population of 500 and more. In Uttar Pradesh the lower limit is only 250 persons. But

*An exception has been made in case of Kerala where the new name has been used. The selected block of this State, Chalakudy, is located in the former State of Travancore-Cochin.

most panchayats cover much larger populations than this minimum figure. It may be added that the general trend in recent years has been to extend panchayats to smaller villages and generally to reduce the jurisdiction of the panchayats. This trend is noticeable in the panchayat legislation of several States including Bombay, Madras and Uttar Pradesh.

In view of the wide variations in the structure of the villages and their population in different parts of the country, it is not possible to indicate any figure as the most suitable for a panchayat. The figure of 5 to 10 thousands which may be necessary for Kerala where the density of population is very high, would be quite unsuitable in an area like Himachal Pradesh or even Orissa as it would result in the panchayats extending over a large number of villages and a large geographical area. But the question of jurisdiction of the panchayat is of considerable importance to the functioning of these institutions, and keeping extreme cases like that of Kerala aside it is useful to have a figure, or preferably a range of figures, about the most appropriate size of a panchayat. The main consideration in favour of small panchayats is the existence of personal relations among the people and the opportunity for intimate contact between the panchayat and the village people. Meetings between the general village body and the panchayat which are provided in the Acts of some States to ensure such contacts are also feasible only where the total population covered by the panchayat is relatively small. It is claimed that such contacts make democracy at the primary level real to the people. On the other hand, administrative viability and efficiency require that the unit should have a minimum size, because if the panchayat is very small its resources would be too small for the responsibilities it has to bear. Even at present the internal resources of the panchayats are in some cases hardly sufficient for meeting the expenses of the most elementary administration. Further, too small a size would become a greater handicap as the development functions of the panchayats expand. Recognising the importance of size to the proper working of the panchayat the Report on the Second Five Year Plan recommends a population of 1,000 as the norm for a panchayat, to be reached, if necessary, by re-drawing the village boundaries*. It is not possible to comment on the suitability of this or any other figure on the basis of the data of this study. As mentioned above, most panchayats included in the study have considerably larger populations. There are only 22 panchayats having populations below 1,000 and these are located in a few blocks notably Sonepat and Batala in Punjab, Manavadar (Saurashtra), Mandya (Mysore) and Bhathat (U.P.). To judge the appropriateness of this norm, it would be necessary to study a large number of panchayats, both small and large.

Division into Wards

In some States *e.g.*, Kerala, Orissa, Assam, Bombay and Madhya Pradesh the panchayat is divided into a number of wards in which different villages or sections of the same village are given adequate representation. This arrangement, however, does not exist in Bihar

*Planning Commission, Government of India—Report on the Second Five Year Plan.

and Assam even though the panchayats in these States are large and cover many villages. Division into wards is a very useful device, but it is liable to misuse. Wards are generally demarcated on the basis of population with more or less equal number of voters and where, the demarcation was carried out by the Revenue Department as in Chalakudy (Kerala), Kolhapur (Bombay), Erode (Madras) and Bhadrak (Orissa), it is considered fair by the people. But the division may be carried out in such a way as to perpetuate the domination of some group or faction. This is the complaint made by all the four panchayats in Morsi (Madhya Pradesh) where the division was carried out by the old nominated panchayats.

Composition of the Panchayats

Panchayats in all States are representative bodies elected on adult franchise. The nominated panchayats which were established in Madhya Pradesh in 1948 were replaced by elected bodies in 1955-56. In the Panchayat Acts of most States, there is provision to give adequate representation to scheduled castes and other under-privileged groups. either by reservation of seats or by nominating members from these groups. In Punjab seats are reserved for the scheduled castes only where they form 10 per cent or more of the total population. In Kerala this is done if this section of the population is 5 per cent or more. In U.P. reservation of seats is generally in proportion to the population of these groups to the total population. In Bihar where the Mukhiya alone is elected, he is expected to give adequate representation to the important castes including the scheduled castes. In a few States, notably Saurashtra and Madhya Bharat, women members were also nominated to the panchayats. But in the two blocks Manavadar and Rajpur, studied in these States, it was reported by the P. E. Os that women did not generally take interest in panchayat activities or even attend the panchayat meetings. This is unfortunate but not surprising in view of the inhibitions against participation of women in social activities. Generally speaking, the representatives of the scheduled castes also do not show enough interest. But it is reported by some P. E. Os. (*e.g.*, of Punjab and U.P.) that election to panchayats on the basis of audit sufferage and election of scheduled caste members to these institutions has created among them a keen awareness of their rights.

Panchayats in most blocks do not have a nominated or *ex-officio* component. However, in the panchayats of Madhya Pradesh, the village *patels* were nominated by virtue of their office. This is reported to have been done with the idea that inclusion of persons having administrative experience and prestige in the village would impart strength to the institution and make it more readily acceptable to the people. But our very limited study suggests that this practice has not only not strengthened the institution, but has actually hampered it. It is reported from all the 4 panchayats studied in the Morsi block that the *patels* have influenced elections and have managed to get their own men elected on the panchayats. As a result, factional rivalries have become more acute and panchayat bodies have been rendered, more or less, ineffective. In Mysore also, where the village *patels* are nominated to all the panchayats and are frequently the presidents of the institutions, the panchayat system in the State is comparatively ineffective.

Size of the Panchayat Body

The strength of the panchayat varies greatly in different States. Thus, in the panchayats of U.P., the number of members of the institution excluding the Sabhapati varies from 15 to 30 depending upon the population. Considering that the jurisdiction of the panchayat is rather small, a fairly high proportion of the households are represented on the panchayat. The 6 panchayats studied in Bhathat block. have nearly 10% of the households represented on them. At the other extreme is Kerala where panchayats with populations of even 10,000 have only 7 members; one additional member is added for every 2,000 persons, the maximum number being only 15. The strength of the panchayats selected for this study is shown in Table 3. A relatively large panchayat is, perhaps, somewhat better suited to represent different sections and interests in the population. If the number of members is very small in relation to the population covered, as in Kerala, certain important sections of the population may remain unrepresented. Similarly, where the jurisdiction of a panchayat extends over a large number of hamlets *e.g.*, in Madras, the body should be sufficiently large, so that all the hamlets can be represented. Of course, it should not be so large as to become unwidely.

Panchayat and the general body of the village

A meaningful relationship between the panchayats and the village community as a whole can exist only where the jurisdiction of the panchayat is not too large, and is confined to one or a very few compact villages. Provision for contact between the panchayat and the general village body exists in the Panchayat Acts of a number of States including Punjab, U.P., Saurashtra and Bihar. Except the last, these are all States where panchayats have small jurisdictions extending over one or a very few villages. In both U.P. and Punjab the panchayat is required to call meetings of the general village body, at least twice a year, inform it of its achievements and programme and present to it a statement of its financial position. In U.P. the budget of the panchayat has to be passed by the village body. In Saurashtra, any person of the village could attend the panchayat meetings. The meetings of the Madhyastha Mandal (State Panchayat Board) were also held in the villages and the people from the village as well as from the neighbouring villages were encouraged to attend these meetings.

The principle of consultation between the panchayat and the village body is a commendable one. It is in accordance with the traditions of western democracy and of the Indian village. The practice of village meetings could, if successful, bring the village people and their elected representatives closer together, and could promote understanding of the working of these institutions. However, experience has not been satisfactory so far. The village body meetings do not evoke any enthusiasm and are generally not effective. Most meetings are very thinly attended. In the panchayats studied in the block of Gorakhpur district of U.P., it was observed that there was no quorum in the village meetings, and the panchayat budgets could be passed only with the help of the clause which provides for the holding of a second meeting without the requirement of a quorum, if the first meeting could not be held for want of it.

Methods of election

In Kerala, Bombay, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh and Hyderabad, elections to the panchayats are held by secret ballot. In Mysore, this method is followed, only if more than 10 members are to be elected. Other States follow the practice of open elections. Election by secret ballot is generally acknowledged to be preferable to open elections, but the latter practice is resorted to on grounds of economy and administrative convenience. It has its obvious disadvantages, however, which often over-shadow its merits. Under this system, free exercise of preference is not always possible. Thus a landless labourer or a member of the scheduled caste, would hesitate to express himself openly against a substantial cultivator with whom he may be under obligation or whom he dare not annoy. The system also tends to aggravate group-tensions, because group preferences have to be openly declared and the rival groups meet face to face.

Elections and groups or factions

An analysis of the impact of election and functioning of panchayats on leadership patterns and group relationships in the villages, would require a much more detailed study than was possible in the course of this enquiry.* However the impressions gathered by the PEOs during the course of their enquiry indicate that in the 35 panchayats where elections were contested, group rivalries have come into existence or increased in as many as 12 panchayts. These impressions support the view that panchayat elections have an influence on group rivalries in the villages.

Unanimous elections

To avoid these rivalries many persons advocate unanimous elections. Such elections are by no means rare; they have been reported from as many as 21 out of the 56 reporting panchayats. However, unanimous election does not necessarily indicate solidarity in the village. It may only show the community's lack of interest in the panchayat. It was observed in two panchayats where there were unanimous elections, that the villagers had no knowledge of them. In another case, the election had been manipulated by interested parties. As the significance of panchayats is better understood, the number of unanimous elections may decline. While unanimity arising from a feeling of solidarity already existing in the village is most desirable, conscious efforts by officials to promote unanimous elections are not likely to lead to happy results. These may only have the effect of increasing corrupt practices and pressure tactics. As the experience of nominated panchayats and of nominated members in elected panchayats demonstrates, attempts to compromise with the democratic principle, however well-intentioned, lead to undesired consequences.

Political parties in elections

It is generally recognised that elections to panchayats should be free from considerations, pertinent to wider party politics and should be influenced by purely local issues and the merits of individual candidates. This position obtains in all States except Kerala

*The P. E. O. publications— "Group Dynamics in a North Indian Village" and "Leadership and Groups in a South Indian Village" contain detailed accounts of the working of leaders and groups in the two selected villages.

where wider issues are brought to bear on the local elections. In this State, the lack of real village units and the large jurisdiction of the panchayats have, in some measure, favoured this development; local bonds and intimate personal contact between individuals in well demarcated areas which are strong in other parts of the country are comparatively weak.

Caste community and kinship play an important part in panchayat elections. As Table 3 shows the majority of panchayat members are from the dominant land owning, high castes. The presidents of panchayats are, almost invariably, from such castes.

Personal Characteristics of Panchayat Members

In order to obtain an idea of the kind of persons who are returned to panchayats, data regarding the age, education, caste, ownership of land and economic and leadership status were obtained for all members of the selected panchayats who were resident in the selected villages. In case of the single village panchayats all members are included, but in case of the multi-village panchayats, members resident in villages not selected for the study are not included. Out of 614 members of these institutions, data were obtained for 547. The results are presented in Table 3. Summary figures for panchayat members and presidents are as follows :—

Particulars of Members and Presidents of the Panchayats

Number of blocks . . .	15
Number of Panchayats studied .	60
Total number of	
(i) Members . . .	547
(ii) Presidents . . .	47

Sl. No.	Particulars	Percentage of total number of members	Percentage of total number of presidents
1	2	3	4
1	*Age group**		
	(i) Below 25 years	1·1	..
	(ii) 25 to 40 years	38·9	46·8
	(iii) 40 years and above	59·6	53·2
2	*Educational Qualifications*		
	(i) Illiterate	42·2	17·0
	(ii) Primary	36·4	44·7
	(iii) Middle	17·0	27·7
	(iv) Matric.	2·9	8·5
	(v) Above Matric	1·5	2·1

*Age-group of 4 members is not available.

1	2	3	4
3	*Ownership of Land*		
	(i) Land holders	88·1	95·7
	(ii) Non-land holders	11·9	4·3
4	*Financial Status*		
	(i) Rich	32·5	89·4
	(ii) Others	67·5	10·6
5	*Caste group*		
	(i) High	69·8	97·9
	(ii) Low	30·2	2·1
6	*Whether Respected*		
	(i) Yes	93·4	89·4
	(ii) No	6·6	10·6
7	*Number of presidents who are conversant with the Panchayat Act*		
	(i) Yes	..	48·9
	(ii) No	..	51·1

Age—It will be noticed that in all blocks except Erode (Madras) and Morsi (Madhya Pradesh) the majority of the panchayat members are above 40 years in age. In some blocks, like Batala and Sonepat (Punjab), Manavadar (Saurashtra and Mandya (Mysore) more than 2/3rd of the members are in this age group. 39 per cent of all panchayat members are in the age group 25 to 40 years and only about one per cent are below 25 years of age. Election of older people to panchayats is in accordance with the traditions of the Indian village, in which leadership and decision making rest mainly with the older people. Apart from the concentration of leaders in the older age groups, another factor favouring return of older persons to panchayats is their relative leisure. It will be seen from the following paragraphs that the great majority of the members are from land owners' households. The older members of such households can have a certain degree of leisure because most of the cultivation work is done by the younger members. It is this type of persons—landholding, middle aged, frequently having younger people to look after cultivation—who take most interest in community affairs, and are returned to panchayats in largest numbers.

Literacy—In the panchayats of 9 out of the 15 selected blocks, the literate members are larger in number than the illiterate. In three blocks Bhadrak (Orissa), Cachar (Assam) and Chalakudy (Kerala), all the panchayat members are literate. In all blocks, the percentage of literacy among panchayat members is significantly higher than among the adult males of the villages. The following figures showing literacy among panchayat members and among the adult male

population in the block are of interest in this connection. The latter figures are of the Bench Mark Survey conducted in these blocks in 1954.

Sl. No.	Name of the block	Percentage of literate members	Percentage of literates in the age group 15 years & above (B.M.S. data)
1	2	3	4
1	Bhadrak	100·00	28·2
2	Batala	42·11	13·9
3	Kolhapur	75·00	12·6
4	Morsi	87.76	31·0
5	Bhathat	41·29	10·2
6	Manavadar	55·00	11·1
7	Mandya	47·06	11·1
8	Rajpur	60·00	30·6
9	Erode	31·82	11·8
10	Cachar	100·00	30·5
11	Chalakudy	100·00	48·4
12	Bodhan	61·53	8·1
13	Pusa	88·37	22·2

As might be expected, most of the literate members have had very little education. 63% have read only upto the primary standard, and most of the remainder are below matric. The matriculates are only 2·9% of the total.

Caste—In most panchayats, the majority of the members come from high castes or rather from castes which are the principal land-owning and cultivating castes of the area. In Cachar (Assam) there is no member from the low castes, while in Bhadrak (Orissa) and Erode (Madras) only 1 out of the 7 and 22 elected members respectively belong to low castes. In all three States there is no provision for reservation of seats for scheduled castes or other backward groups. Such provision which is made in the Acts of most States, appears necessary for adequate representation of the interests of these groups. In Manavadar (Saurashtra) the majority of panchayat members are listed as belonging to low castes. Actually, many of these belong to castes like *Ahirs* which are the dominant cultivating castes in the villages. This is borne out by the fact that majority of the members are land-owners.

Ownership of Land—The great majority of members (82% of the total) are land-owners. In Bhadrak, Mandya and Bhathat there is no member who does not own some land. In the last block, most of villagers have come to acquire land after the abolition of Zamindari.

The number of landless members is appreciable in Erode, Manavadar and Rajpur, the figures being about 40% in the first two cases and 35% in the last.

Wealth—While most of the members own land, only a few are considered rich by their fellow villagers. The word 'rich' is used here, in a relative sense, *i.e.*, whether a person is considered so by the local people. Among the different centres, Manavadar has the highest percentage (60%) of rich members and Morsi the lowest (6·1%).

Leadership status—Leadership status is even more a matter of public opinion than wealth. We collected information to find out to what extent, a member of the panchayat is also regarded as a 'leader' by the village people. These data show that in most panchayats, the majority (55%) of the members are generally respected in their villages. Another 34% are respected only by their own groups or factions. However, in Morsi (Madhya Pradesh) where the P. E. O. reported that the nominated *patels* did not enjoy the confidence of the villagers; the majority of the members do not seem to have it either.

The Panchayat President

The president of the panchayat, who is known as the *Sabhapati* in Uttar Pradesh, *Mukhiya* in Bihar, *Sarpanch* in Punjab and by similar names elsewhere is by far the most important member of the institution. He is, in fact, its head and is often assigned a number of administrative and executive functions. In most States the execution of works programmes taken up on behalf of the panchayat is the responsibility of the President. He also plays an important role in the assessment and collection of taxes, levied by the panchayat. In some States, the president is empowered to exercise disciplinary control on the secretary and other staff of the panchayat. The working of a panchayat depends to a large extent upon his personality. One major difficulty in the functioning of the panchayats at present is that most presidents are not qualified by education or training to carry out adequately the functions, or to assume the responsibilities, entrusted to them under the Panchayat Laws. As their level of education is generally low, the great majority of them do not fully understand their duties and responsibilities. Also, in most states no serious attempt has been made to enlighten them on the provisions of the Panchayat Act. About half the presidents of the panchayats studied, were not conversant with the Panchayat Act. The most notable attempt to educate the presidents and other members of the panchayats was made in Saurashtra where training camps were organised for the purpose. The members of the Madhyastha Mandal (the State Panchayat Board) and the District Panchayat Mandals also played an active part in educating the panchayat members. Programmes of training panchayat members through Village Leaders' Training Camps were taken up in some other States also, including Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh, but sufficient efforts do not seem to have been made. It is obvious that the panchayats cannot work efficiently unless the presidents and members are given adequate training and are fully conversant with the provisions of the Panchayat Acts.

As regards the election of panchayat presidents the system of direct election by the electorate prevails in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madras, Assam and Saurashtra. In Bihar, the president (Mukhiya) alone is elected and he nominates other members of the panchayat. In U.P., where the president (Sabhapati) is directly elected, it is often his election alone that rouses the interest of the electorate. In three of the six Panchayats studied in the Bhathat block, the Panchayat presidents' election alone was contested. The main advantage claimed for the system of direct election of the president is that it brings out the real leader of the village. However, the system is not without its disadvantages. Thus it is reported from Erode (Madras), where both the president and the members are directly elected, that the president is not able to function effectively because the other members do not fully co-operate with him. The Madras Government have decided to replace this system by that of indirect election of the president. The Bihar system where the Mukhiya alone is elected has the added disadvantage that the functioning of the panchayat depends greatly on the personality of a single individual. The system of indirect election appears to be working satisfactorily in all the panchayats studied, except in those of Sonepat, where the P.E.O. feels that the president (Sarpanch) is often not the real leader of the village, and cannot function properly, because he is under an obligation to the members and has to support them even by going out of his way. He further reports that the system leads to aggravation of fractional rivalries within the village.

Data regarding the personal characteristics of presidents of the panchayats studied have been given on pages 107-108. It will be seen that the majority of the presidents are above 40 years of age. Only 8 are illiterate, but most have had education only up to the primary or middle school stage. It is noteworthy that an over-whelming majority of the presidents are rich landowners, and belong to high castes. Presidentship of panchayats is concentrated in the more affluent class of cultivators even more than panchayat membership. Among the members, due to the reservation provisions and other reasons, there is still a considerable proportion of persons from the less favoured and less powerful sections of the community. But very few presidents belong to these sections.

The Panchayat Secretary

Most Panchayat Acts provide for the appointment of a panchayat secretary to maintain the records and accounts of the panchayats and to look after other routine duties. However. there is very great inter-state variation in matters like the method of recruitment of the secretary, his status as a government or panchayat servant or as a full or part time employee, his pay, educational qualifications and training etc. Some data on such inter-state variations are given in Table 4.

In several states including Punjab, U.P., Bihar, Orissa and Kerala, the secretaries are full-time persons. In Bombay, Hyderabad and Assam, on the other hand, they may be full-time or part-time In Punjab and U.P. the full-time secretaries generally look after several panchayats. In Punjab the secretary is paid entirely by the panchayat. In U.P., on the other hand, he is a government servant, who looks after the work of the Nyaya Panchayat (judicial pan-

chayat), a number of Gaon Panchayats and performs, in addition, some of the functions of the Grama Sevak in some of the villages in his area. In Saurashtra also the panchayat secretaries are full-time government employees looking after the work of several panchayats. In this area, the 'A' and 'B' class panchayats were entrusted with the collection of land revenue. It was necessary for them to have whole time persons to look after the work. For some time, the panchayat secretaries worked as gram sevaks, but the practice has been discontinued. In Bihar, Orissa, and Kerala, the panchayat secretary who is a full-time government servant is expected to look after a single panchayat. It may be recalled that in all these states, the panchayats have rather large jurisdictions. In Bihar, the panchayat secretary, who is called the gram sevak, is expected to attend to a number of duties like maintenance of agricultural and vital statistics in addition to his panchayat work. He is also actively associated with all development activities within the panchayat area. In Kerala, the panchayat secretary (called Panchayat Executive Officer) has been given extensive executive powers, with the result that the president and the members complain that they have no control over him. In Bombay, the panchayat secretary may be a full-time or a part-time worker whose salary is paid by the panchayat with or without some contribution from the Government. He is a servant of the panchayat and under the full control of the president. In Madras, panchayat secretaries are appointed in only class 'A' panchayats which have a population of not less than 5000 persons and an annual income of not less than Rs. 10,000. But the smaller panchayats usually have clerks to look after the routine duties. In Mysore, no separate secretaries are appointed and the *Shanbhog* (Patwari) is expected to maintain the accounts of the panchayat on receipt of a small remuneration. A somewhat similar practice is followed in Madhya Bharat and Bhopal where the local school teacher (or in his absence another local person) is expected to maintain the panchayat records for an allowance of Rs. 10 per month. In all three cases, the results are reported to be unsatisfactory. The persons concerned do not take adequate interest in the work, because they are not under the Panchayat Department and the remuneration given is not attractive enough.

What type of candidates—what his calibre and qualifications are—comes forward for the post of panchayat secretary is, in great measure, influenced by the system of recruitment and the pay of the post. Thus, in Kerala, where the panchayat secretaries are full-time government servants and have good pay scales, they are all matriculates and above. Frequently, they are graduates, and they get a higher scale of pay than others. In States like U.P., Bihar and Saurashtra, where the secretaries are full-time government servants, matriculates or persons with somewhat lower qualifications are generally available for these posts. On the other hand, in Hyderabad, where the pay was only Rs. 12 per month the secretaries had generally low educational qualifications. In one of the panchayats in the Bodhan block, the secretary had read only up to the primary standard.

Many of the States have made arrangements for the training of panchayat secretaries. The duration of training varies all the way from six months in Saurashtra to 21 days in Kerala. The training system in Saurashtra was comprehensive and included instructions in the Panchayat Act, maintenance of records and accounts, as

well as elements of agriculture, animal husbandry and social education. In Madhya Pradesh, the panchayat secretaries were given three months' training in the maintenance of records and accounts and organisation of social welfare activity.

The extent of control exercised by the panchayat on the secretary also varies from state to state. In general, this control is much less where the panchayat secretaries are full-fledged government servants or are looking after a number of panchayats than where they are servants of a single panchayat. The case of Kerala has been mentioned above. In U.P. also, even though the Act makes provision for control over the secretary by the panchayat and, especially, by the president, in practice there is very little control. On the contrary, it has been reported by the P.E.O., that under the pretext of ensuring that the provisions of the Panchayat Act and the rules and orders issued under it by the State Government are followed by the panchayat, he sometimes assumes the role of supervisory officer.

The extent of control over the panchayat secretary depends frequently upon the personality of the president. As the majority of the presidents are uneducated, they have to depend upon the secretaries for interpreting the rules and government orders. This dependence well continue until the president and the members are educated, have full training and can themselves understand their powers and obligations. In Punjab where the pay of the secretary is contributed by the panchayat. the extent of control is greater than in U.P. But even there, according to the PEO the panchayat secretary is, in fact, controlled by the Government. In Bombay, on the other hand, where the secretaries are full or part time servants of a single panchayat, they are almost under the full control of the panchayat.

The question of the relationship between the panchayat and its staff including the secretary is of considerable importance. Two alternative points of view are possible on it: (i) that the panchayats should have full powers over their staff; and (ii) that the panchayats should be assisted by full-time trained executives who should be servants of a higher body. The first alternative is consistent with the autonomy of the panchayat and allows it fuller scope for development. But, for this alternative to work the panchayats members and especially the presidents, should be persons of sufficient calibre who understand their powers and responsibilities. This condition is, unfortunately fulfilled in few instances only. We have already described the calibre and qualification of panchayat members and presidents. The secretary should, of course, be paid by the panchayat. It will, however, be seen in the Section on Resources, that the resources of the panchayats in most States are not large enough. Even in the few States like Punjab and Bombay where the income of the panchayat is adequate, the pay of the secretary and other staff takes up a substantial proportion of it. In many states it will be found that the panchayats can pay their secretaries, wholly or in large part, only if their jurisdictions are considerably larger. But then the panchayat may become too large for real democracy at the lower level. There are two ways out of this dilemma; either a higher body should subsidise the panchayat to enable it to engage a qualified secretary, or the secretary should be paid directly by this higher body. The first solution would seem to be the proper one;

the second would reduce the control of the panchayat over its secretary. But in order to make the first solution practicable, the members of the panchayat and especially the presidents should be trained to discharge their responsibilities properly. The first step in real democracy has always been to train the immediate, if not the ultimate masters.

The higher body, the state government or the District Council, could still assume responsibility for the training of the panchayat secretaries, and it may also require the panchayat to appoint their secretaries from among trained candidates only. The rate at which a programme of this kind can be worked out would govern the progress of the panchayats towards effective rural democracy.

Panchayat and Local Bodies

The relationship between the panchayat and higher level local bodies like the District Board, the Taluka or Tehsil Board or the Janpada Sabha is both important and difficult. This question as also the larger question of reorganisation of the local bodies are being considered by the State Governments. In some States, notably the former 'B' State of Madhya Bharat, a system of interrelated democratic institutions with the panchayat at the village level and the Mandal Panchayat at the district level was tried. The arrangement has some similarity to the system of Panchayat Samities at the block level and Zilla Parishads at the district level which has been recently recommended by the COPP Team on Community Projects and N.E.S.* This study is, however, concerned with the relationship between the higher bodies and the panchayats, only in so far as it affects the working of the panchayats. But our data are scanty, because the influence of local bodies on the working of the panchayats could be observed in only two blocks, Kolhapur (Bombay) and Morsi (Madhya Pradesh) and even in these it was not very marked. The main reason is that the Panchayat Acts in many States do not cover the relationship that should exist between panchayats and higher level local bodies. Moreover in most States the latter have been either dissolved or are in process of disintegration.

In Kolhapur the panchayats are under the dual control of the District Local Board and the State Government. The District Local Board is responsible for passing the budget, auditing the accounts and providing general guidance to the panchayats while the State Government exercises control mainly through the inspection carried out by the district level Special Officer for Panchayats. Apart from the disadvantages incidental to dual control, no other marked difficulty has been experienced in this case. In Morsi also, the panchayats are under the dual control of the Janapada Sabha and Social Welfare Department of the State Government. The Janapada Sabha have not, however, done their duty satisfactorily. They did not pass the budgets of the panchayats studied, for a long period; nor did they make available to these the proceeds of the land cess granted by the State Government with the result that the panchayats could not undertake any activity. Further, it was reported, in 2 out of the 4 panchayats studied, that the politics of the Janapada Sabha intruded into the elections to the panchayats; group rivalries were intensified and the working of the panchayats adversely affected.

*Report of the C. O. P. P. Team on Community Project and National Extension Service Vol. I—Chapter I.

Panchayats and State Governments

Most States have an inspection organisation for inspection of the panchayats, audit of accounts and general guidance to them in working. There are Panchayat Officers at the district level with inspector-level staff below them. There are some exceptions to this, however. In Mysore, the panchayats have remained with the Revenue Department and their inspection is looked after by the district and lower level officers of the Department. The arrangement has not been found to be satisfactory because the Revenue Officers being already over-burdened with other work have neither the time nor the will in taking an active interest in working of panchayats. Association of Revenue Deputy Collectors with panchayat work in Madhya Bharat was also found to be similarly unsatisfactory. In some States, notably Bombay and Madhya Pradesh, there is dual control of panchayats by the State Government on the one hand and a higher level local body on the other. This body is the District Board in Bombay and the Janapada Sabha in Madhya Pradesh.

The main difficulty reported by the PEOs about the inspection system is that inspector-level staff have frequently very large jurisdictions, as a result of which inspection is inadequate both in frequency and intensity. Some PEOs have reported that some of the panchayats in the evaluation blocks have not been inspected even once since their formation. A number of panchayats included in the study have been inspected less than once a year. Thus, in Manavadar 2 out of the 4 selected panchayats have been inspected only once during the last 3-4 years. In Batala, none of the selected panchayats has been inspected more than twice since their establishment in 1952. The position regarding auditing of panchayat accounts is also unsatisfactory. It is reported from Bhathat (U.P.) that panchayat accounts have not been audited since the formation of the panchayats and it is only recently that a decision has been taken to audit them. In the Batala and Sonepat blocks of Punjab, auditing has not been done for the last 3-4 years. In both these blocks, the villagers appear to be rather conscious of this deficiency, as is seen from the fact that quite a proportion of the selected respondents have expressed the need for proper auditing of accounts as a step towards improving the functioning of the panchayats. (Table 11).

Mainly because of their large jurisdictions but at least partly because of their pre-occupation with administrative matters, the panchayat inspection staff in most States have not given adequate guidance to panchayats for improving their working. Their visits, not very frequent, are concerned primarily with administrative matters.

Education of members in the role and significance of these panchayats and guidance in the proper methods of functioning of these institutions should start with a brief initial training and should be followed by day to day advice by the secretary, and periodic, but not very infrequent, guidance from the inspector level staff. It has been mentioned above that arrangements for initial training of members through short training camps have existed only in a few States like U.P. and Saurashtra and that the panchayat secretaries are frequently untrained. With the inspector level staff also largely unavailable for this purpose, lack of arrangements for guidance of the members can be said to be complete.

Mention may be made here of a negative aspect of the State Government's relationship with the panchayats. In spite of the fact that wide powers and responsibilities have been given to panchayats in all States, *de facto* control has remained in the hands of government officials in many of them. In U.P., the panchayats cannot incur any expenditure, except for very minor amounts, without the approval of the Panchayat Inspector and the Assistant Panchayat Raj Officer. In Kerala, the panchayats' power to sanction non-recurring expenditure is limited to Rs. 200. In a number of other States also, control is exercised largely by the government and the powers of the panchayats are very limited. Such control might be justified under exceptional circumstances but when exercised in the day to day functioning of the panchayats it has the effect of only dampening the enthusiasm of the panchayat members and thwarting their initiative. Besides creating a feeling among the members that they have no real powers, it gives rise to the impression among the people that the panchayat is a part of government administration. A number of PEOs have reported the prevalance of this kind of feeling in the panchayat villages studied by them.

Panchayats and the Blocks

Development of strong self-reliant democratic institutions at the base is one of the fundamental objectives of the community development and N.E.S. programme. The block pattern envisages that activity relating to development of panchayats should be coordinated at the block level, in the same way as in other fields like agriculture and cooperation. However, the block pattern had not so far provided an independent block level specialist on panchayats; it envisaged a common specialist for cooperation and panchayats. As a result, strengthening of staff in this field and coordination of work with that of the block staff did not take place to the desired extent. Even the jurisdiction of the panchayat inspector has continued to be different from the blocks in many States. The position of course varies considerably in different States, and in some, progress in coordination of activities has been much greater than in others. Thus, in U.P., the District Planning Officer who has overall charge of the community development programme and N.E.S. programme is also the district level officer for panchayats. The panchayat inspectors and the panchayat secretaries are under the control of the BDO who might well be considered the block level officer for panchayats. The relationship has been carried further by making the presidents of all the panchayats in the block *ex-officio* members of the Block Advisory Committee. In Saurashtra, the B.D.O. was himself the panchayat officer for the block area. In other States also, steps have been taken for coordination between the panchayat and the project staff and with the recent revision in the block pattern which provides for an independent block level specialist for panchayats, this process will receive a great stimulus. Moreover, the reduction in the charge of the inspector and re-orientation of his functions, which are implied in this change should also help to reduce the deficiencies in inspection and in guidance to the panchayats.

As regards the role of the project staff in the functioning of the Panchayats included in this study, this appears to have been limited to carrying out certain development activities in the panchayat villages. The projects have given fairly large financial grants for execution of such development programmes. Data regarding financial

assistance from the projects the contributions by the panchayats and the *ad hoc* contributions by the people for these activities are given in the section on Resources. All these activities are properly the responsibility of the panchayats, and by undertaking them, the projects have done a job for the panchayats which they could not have done on their own.

However, the job has not been done with the panchayats, nor has it necessarily had the effect of strengthening the institution. As has been explained in the section on Functioning of Panchayats, *ad hoc* development committees as Vikas Mandals were formed in many States for execution of development works. In some areas, these committees were fully associated with panchayats; in others, the association was inadequate and in still others like Madhya Pradesh these committees functioned as rivals of the panchayats. In some States, the works were entrusted to contractors (who had also the responsibility for mobilizing popular participation) and the panchayats were not associated. The project staff were more concerned with execution of the works in specified periods than with strengthening of institution. As a result, the opportunities of strengthening the panchayat institutions, which availability of substantial financial resources offered, have not been fully or even adequately utilized.

Panchayats and the Gram Sevaks

Even though promotion of panchayat activity in his area is an important responsibility of the Gram Sevak, he is not formally associated with the panchayats in any State. In Saurashtra, the gram sevaks were made panchayat secretaries for a time but this arrangement could not be continued. In U.P., the gram sevaks are not given panchayat work but the panchayat secretaries are required to carry on certain development activities in some of their villages. The gram sevaks in their turn keep in touch with the panchayats and try to execute project activities, particularly construction programmes, through the panchayat agency. In Bihar also, the panchayat secretary is associated with development activity. However, in a number of other States of which Kerala is one example, the panchayat secretary is not connected with the block development programme in any way. Association of panchayats with development activities and active contacts between them and the gram sevak are to the benefit of both, and the importance of these can be hardly over-emphasised.

Resources of Panchayats

The problem of resources is about the most difficult one faced by panchayats. In most States, the Acts include a long list of sources of revenue for them. However, in practice, most of these sources exist on paper only; they are not tapped, and the panchayats' income from the few sources that are tapped is very small. In many cases, the initial resources are barely sufficient to pay for expenditure on establishment only. In Mandya (Mysore), where the panchayats have been long in existence, the income is so small that two panchayats have kept their money on deposit for a long time and have incurred no expenditure at all.

The income of the panchayats may be classified as follows :—

(1) Self-raised or independent income, which may be further divided into

(a) taxes; and

(b) other incomes, *e.g.* income from Village common land, ponds, fisheries, fruit trees, etc.

(2) Government grants, including both regular grants and *ad hoc* grants received for specific purposes. The contributions from projects have to be included in the latter category.

(3) *Ad hoc* contributions from the people for specific development work may be listed as the third important resource to the village panchayats. These contributions are generally made to match government grants for specific development activities. The public contributions as well as the government grants may not always be made to the panchayats. But, they are important source of funds to the village, and should be considered along with funds at the disposal of the panchayats in the context of rural development.

Self-raised or independent income

(a) *Taxes*.—Even though the laws of all States permit the panchayat to levy a number of taxes, only one or two taxes bring in the bulk of tax income of most panchayats. This is brought out by the following figures showing the contribution of the most important taxes, to the independent income of the panchayats.

Sl. No.	Block/State	Tax	Percentge of independent income of the Panchayat
1	2	3	4
1.	Bodhan (Hyderabad)	(i) Property tax	36.46
		(ii) Weekly market	19.81
		(iii) Toll Tax	7.91
2.	Cachar (Assam)	Chowkidari Tax	92.97
3.	Pusa (Bihar)	(i) Labour tax	67.06
		(ii) Profession tax	1.60
4.	Kolhapur (Bombay)	(i) House tax	67.74
		(ii) Bazar tax	8.14
		(iii) Hotels and shops	6.28
5.	Manavadar (Saurashtra)	(i) Income from Panchayat property.	49.38
		(ii) Sale of land	25.04
		(iii) Cattle pound	8.91
6.	Morsi (Madhya Pradesh)	(i) Property, House tax	52.98
		(ii) Land cess	12.12
		(iii) Profession tax	3.96
7.	Erode (Madras)	(i) Surcharge on stamp duty	43.33
		(ii) Land cess	11.47
		(iii) House tax	6.84
8.	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat)	(i) Bazar tax	22.15
		(ii) House tax	14.00
		(iii) Labour tax	14.87

1	2	3	4
9. Bhadrak (Orissa)		(i) Panchayat tax	52.26
		(ii) Licence fees	18.39
10. Batala (Punjab)		(i) House tax	27.01
		(ii) Shamlat Land	26.82
11. Sonepat (Punjab)		(i) Shamlat land	59.46
		(ii) House tax	16.87
12. Chalakudy (Kerala)		(i) Rates and taxes	71.07
		(ii) Revenue from panchayat property	13.03
		(iii) Licence fee	3.44
13. Bhathat (Uttar Pradesh)		(i) Land cess	55.49
		(ii) Income from Gaon Samaj land	26.03

The table also gives an idea of the different kinds of taxes levied by panchayats. The house tax or property tax is levied in the blocks of Bombay, Hyderabad, Madhya Pradesh and Punjab and is an important source of revenue to the panchayats in these States. In a number of other States, the major source of panchayat income is the land cess which is a surcharge on the land revenue levied by the State Governments. In Madras, the surcharge on stamp duty is another important indirect tax. Tax on trades and professions is the third important tax of the panchayats. It will be seen that some panchayats do not impose any tax on their constituents. Thus, in Manavadar (Saurashtra) the panchayats have hardly any income from taxes. Again in Pusa (Bihar), the main tax imposed by panchayats is the labour tax. A person can pay the tax in cash instead of labour; but it is not a cash obligation to start with.

Besides taxes, the other important source of panchayat revenues is income from common property, chiefly common land. This is important in some blocks *e.g.*, those of Punjab, Saurashtra, Uttar Pradesh and Kerala. In the Saurashtra block practically the entire independent income of the panchayats comes from this source.

The individual sources of revenue are discussed below:

(i) *The House Tax.*—The tax is levied in 8 out of the 15 blocks studied. In all blocks, except those of the Punjab, the basis of taxation is the value of the house. Sometimes, as in Mandya (Mysore) the tax is progressive, the rate of taxation increasing with the value of the house. In the Punjab blocks, a household tax which is called the *Chulha* (lit-hearth) tax is levied on all the households, but at different rates for landholding and other households. Thus in the Sonepat block, the rates are Rs. 2 per year on all land holders and Re. 1 per year on households possessing no land of their own. The same rate applies to all landholders, big and small. However, very poor households are generally exempted from payment of the tax.

In order that the house tax may remain related to the value of the household's real property, assessments have to be revised from time to time. This is, however, not done always. Thus, it is reported from Kolhapur (Bombay), and Mandya (Mysore) that even

though the values of house property have gone up considerably in recent years, assessments which were fixed 15 to 20 years ago have not been revised upward.

The house tax, property administered, is one of the most suitable taxes for the panchayats. It is simple and direct and practically universal in its incidence, so that it makes all persons in the village feel that they have a stake in the good government of the village. It can be adjusted to the economic status of the households and such adjustments will be easily understood by the villagers.

(*ii*) *Land Cess.*—Land cess or a surcharge on the land revenue is levied in several States including U.P., Madras and Madhya Bharat. In U.P., it forms the most important source of revenue of the panchayat. As it is collected along with land revenue, it does not raise any administrative problem. It will be seen from Table 8 that in contrast with other taxes, especially the house tax, there is little or no opposition to this tax so long as it is a small proportion of the land revenue. But the same reason explains why the yield from it continues to be limited.

(*iii*) *Tax on the trade and professions.*—This tax is levied in different ways in different areas *e.g.*, profession tax, tax on vendors, tax on bazars, markets, *hats*, etc. The tax is important especially in the larger villages which have markets, permanent or periodic. The tax makes an important contribution to panchayat revenues in Bodhan, Kolhapur, Erode, Rajpur, Bhadrak and Chalakudy. As the tax has a limited incidence, it is also not generally resented (Table 8).

(*iv*) *Labour Tax.*—As mentioned above, in Pusa (Bihar), the most important source of panchayat revenue is the labour tax. The tax is levied in two other blocks also Rajpur (Madhya Bharat) and Ashta (Bhopal); but the contribution it makes to panchayat revenues is small. The panchayats of several blocks including those of Punjab and U.P. have played an important part in organising Shramdan (labour contribution) for development works. But the levy is compulsory in only the above mentioned three areas.

(*v*) *Other Taxes.*—Among other taxes, mention may be made of the Chowkidari tax in Assam, which is the main source of income of the local panchayats; tax on carts and similar vehicles which is important in Bhathat, Erode and Rajpur; the entertainment tax in Chalakudy; the toll tax in Bodhan and taxes on marriage ceremonies and adoption of children in Kolhapur.

Inspite of what has been provided in the Panchayat Acts, panchayat revenues are derived in most cases from one, two or three taxes only. This is due mainly to the panchayats' unwillingness to tax themselves. Even a simple tax like the house tax is not levied by the panchayats in many States. Taxation of easily taxable moveable property like carts and bicycles is also not widespread. In the

Bihar, and Saurashtra blocks, the panchayats are not willing to impose any financial burden on the villagers. In the U.P. block also, the main reliance is on surcharge on the land revenue and other taxes are not levied. It is only in a rare case like Kolhapur, that panchayats have shown any imagination whatever and have levied a tax like that on marriages.

Again the rates of assessment of the taxes which are actually levied are frequently kept low. Wherever minimum and maximum rates have been prescribed in the Act, the general tendency is to impose only the minimum rate. This is brought out by the following table which gives also an estimate of the possible increases in income that could result if the maximum rates were charged.

Block	Tax	Rate	No. of panchayats: Reporting	No. of panchayats: Reporting maximum rate	Income (Rs.): Present	Income (Rs.): With maximum rate estimated
1. Kolhapur (Bombay).	House Tax.	As. -/4/- to As. -/8/- per cent of value of house.	6	1	6,346	10,172
2. Bhathat (U.P.)	Land cess	6 pies to 1 anna per rupee.	6	2	354	525

Moreover, speaking generally the panchayats are either unwilling or unable to collect the taxes which they have imposed. They hesitate to exert pressure on the tax-payers for fear of becoming unpopular with them. As a result, collection is unsatisfactory in most cases. The percentages of tax realised by the panchayats covered by this study are as follows:

Centre/State	No. of panchayats studied	Average of 3 years (1954-55 to 1956-57)	Remarks
Bodhan (Hyderabad)	2	42.90	
Cachar (Assam)	2	40.34	
Pusa (Bihar)	4	26.16	
Kolhapur (Bombay)	6	52.71	For 2 panchayats only for 1954-55 and 1955-56.
Morsi (Madhya Pradesh)	4	44.59	
Erode (Madras)	4	43.36	
Bhadrak (Orissa)	2	64.10	One panchayat only.
Batala (Punjab)	5	18.00	
Sonepat (Punjab)	4	75.29	For 3 panchayats, in 1956-57.
Chalakudy (Kerala)	3	34.01	
Bhathat (U.P.)	6	32.02	
Mandya (Mysore)	5	35.43	

NOTE.—For Manavadar (Saurashtra) the figure is 100%. But it is based on data for only 1 panchayat for one year and 2 panchayats for two years.

It will be seen that in most blocks, the tax realisation is less than 50% of the dues. In Bhathat it is as low as 17% and in Pusa, 26% Sonepat has comparatively the best performance in this respect. The P.E.Os' reports point a picture of general apathy and reluctance to pay the taxes. It is reported from Batala (Punjab), for instance, that the people are averse to paying the house tax and large arrears have piled up. In U.P., similarly large arrears had accumulated and the Government had to intervene in many cases and appoint *Kurkamins* to collect the taxes. In Kerala, besides the people's reluctance to pay the taxes, the procedure for collection is also not conducive to quick and efficient collection. The panchayats are required to serve demand notices for each item of tax every six months. If the notice is not served within the next six months, the amount lapses automatically. The procedure involves a lot of clerical work and in most cases, the demand notices are not served in time. Moreover the tax-payers are required to pay the tax in the panchayat office, and as the panchayats cover large areas, payment of the tax involves walking long distances, spending money on ferry charges, etc. There is obvious scope for simplifying the procedure for realising taxes, and making it easier for the tax-payers to pay them.

Tax-collection is a difficult problem for the panchayats; they can neither afford to employ special collection staff nor exert great pressure on the tax-payers, who do not as yet show a high sense of civic responsibility. Frequently panchayats are assisted by revenue staff in collecting these taxes and in some cases where they do not receive this assistance, there is demand for it. All this is a reflection of the panchayats' lack of confidence in themselves. Moreover, reliance on the revenue staff to collect taxes for them would tend to identify the panchayat with the executive arm of the government in the eyes of the villager.

Other sources of panchayat income

Village common land is the most important source of non-tax income for the panchayats. Income from such lands is singnificant for the panchayats of Punjab, U.P. and Saurashtra. In Sonepat (Punjab), it forms more than half of the total internal income of the panchayats studied; in Manavadar (Saurashtra), it is more than 3/4th. Besides income from the cultivation or pasturage on this land, there is occasionally income from fisheries, groves, etc. Most of the P.E.Os in the areas where panchayats possess common land report that the income could be substantially increased by proper development and utilization of the resources. In the panchayats of Punjab blocks there is scope for reclamation of some of the waste-lands and stocking the village ponds with fish. In the U.P. block panchayats also there is very substantial scope for improving the common lands, which are called Gaon Samaj lands in this State after the Village Committee which manages these lands. This Committee is the same as the Gram Panchayat with the difference that instead of the Panchayat Secretary, the Lakhpal (Patwari) is its Secretary.

Government grants

The basis on which Government grants are available to the panchayats and the importance of these grants relatively to their total resources differ greatly from state to state. Thus, the panchayats

of the Saurashtra block derive more than 70% of the income from recurring grants made by the government. If *ad hoc* grants, available for specific purposes are also included, the contribution of government would rise to more than 90 %. The government also pays the salary of the panchayat secretaries. Data on regular and other grants given by government to the panchayats are given in Tables 5 and 6 The figures of regular government grants in Table 5 do not give in all cases a complete picture of the regular assistance rendered. Thus in U.P., where the government does not give any recurring grant, it bears the entire expenses of the panchayat secretary. The same is true of Bihar. On the other hand, in the Punjab, the government makes a grant to the panchayats but does not make any contribution towards the pay of the secretary. The expenditure on the secretary in U.P. and Bihar should properly be counted as a recurring grant from the government.

The regular or recurring grant from government most commonly takes the form of giving back to the panchayat a proportion of land revenue collected from its area. In Punjab, this proportion is 10%; in Bombay, it is about 30%. In the Saurashtra, the panchayats were divided into three categories, A, B and C, and the assistance given to these was 33, 25, and 17½ per cent, respectively, of the land revenue collected. It may be mentioned that the A and B class panchayats were supposed to collect land revenue and the higher assistance given to them represented in part, compensation for the service rendered Provision for panchayats collecting land revenue and receiving a commission for the work exists in the Panchayat Acts of other States also; notably of U.P. and Bihar. But none of the panchayats included in this study had undertaken this work. In a few States like Assam and Kerala, government makes a lump sum grant to the panchayats. In Assam where the Rural Panchayats are very large the government has given lump sum grant of Rs. 55,000 for 5 years to the panchayats which had been organised before 1955-56, and Rs. 35,000 for three years to those which were organised after this date. In Kerala the Act provides for Government contribution up to a maximum of Rs. 2,000 per panchayat.

Ad hoc grants

Besides these recurring grants the panchayats receive substantial *ad hoc* grants. This system had been in operation even before the project, in some States like Bombay, Punjab, Madras, and Madhya-Pradesh. The system, however, received a great fillip with the coming of the community projects and N.E.S. blocks, under which large grants were made available for community works. In most States, the panchayats were associated with these activities and grants were channelled through them. In some areas, however, *ad hoc* committees were formed under the auspices of the panchayat for construction of the works. The working of *ad hoc* committees or Vikas Mandals formed for the purpose of executing project programmes was discussed in earlier Evaluation Reports. In some States like Punjab and Madras where the committees were associated with the panchayats, they worked with some degree of success. But in Morsi (Madhya Pradesh) where both the panchayats and the Vikas Mandals were independent nominated bodies, the rivalry between the two institutions caused great difficulty.

The role of panchayats in development programmes is discussed in the next section on 'Functioning of Panchayats'.

Income and expenditure of the selected panchayats:

Data on three years' average income and expenditure of selected panchayats are given in Table 5. Further details of expenditure on development activities incurred in the panchayat villages are given in Table 6. The figures in Table 5 do not include grants to panchayats from the project and other *ad hoc* grants from the government. These are, however, included along with *ad hoc* contributions from the people in Table 6 which gives as complete an account as would be had of the total development expenditure in all the villages selected for this study*. As mentioned above, all this expenditure is not necessarily channelled through the panchayats and does not, therefore, always appear in the panchayat budgets. However, it is very important to have an idea of the magnitude of the total development expenditure because it shows the extent of development activity undertaken in those villages and the relative role of panchayats in it.

It will be seen from the data in Table 5 that the average annual income (including regular government grants but excluding *ad hoc* grants) varies from more than Rs. 12,000 per panchayat in Chalakudy to less than Rs. 300 per panchayat in Mandya. However, because of the large variations in the population covered by panchayats, it is more significant to compare the *per capita* figures. These vary from Rs. 3·6 in Manavadar to Rs. 0·34 in Mandya and Rs. 0·17 in Bhadrak.

These figures include the regular grants received by the panchayats from the government. Of greater interest are figures of the income raised by the panchayats from their own sources as these give an indication of panchayat's own strength. The *per capita* income of panchayats raised from their own sources varies from Rs. 1·64 in Erode (Madras) to Rs. 0·07 in Cachar (Assam). The distribution of blocks by size of *per capita* income of the panchayats is as follows:—

Income (*per capita*)	No.	Blocks
Above Re. 1.00 . . .	3	Erode, Bodhan, Sonepat.
Re. 0.75 to Re. 1.00 . .	3	Kolhapur, Morsi, Ashta.
Re. 0.50 to Re. 0.75 . .	3	Chalakudy, Batala, Pusa.
Below Re. 0.50 . . .	5	Cachar, Bhathat, Bhadrak, Manavadar & Rajpur.

*The number of selected villages is less than the total number of villages covered by the selected panchayats because in case of multi-village panchayats, only 2-3 villages per panchayat were selected for the study.

Thus, there are only three blocks in which the panchayats are able to mobilise annually Re. 1/- or more *per capita* from their own sources. These figures show the extent of poverty of these institutions. It is also interesting to know that Manavadar (Saurashtra) which has a much larger *per capita* income than all others, if government grants are included, is found in the lowest category in the above table.

Since the income raised by the panchayats themselves is very low, even the most elementary administrative expenses take up a very large share of it. The proportion of administrative expenditure to total regular income is more than 50% in the panchayats of as many as 3 out of the 14 blocks for which data is available. Comparing this expenditure in relation of the self-raised income of the panchayats, it will be seen that in at least two cases—Cachar and Manavadar, it is not sufficient to meet even this expenditure. (Table 5)*. Further, the panchayats in only three blocks, Erode, Bodhan and Sonepat would have left with them, after meeting the administrative expenditure, Re. 1/- or more *per capita* to spend on routine civic duties like cleaning of streets and on development activities.

Development Expenditure in Panchayat villages

The figures on development expenditure in Table 6 present a brighter picture. In all these areas which belong to the first community projects, very substantial grants have been available from the projects and also from other government sources. At least, in some of them, substantial resources have also been raised through *ad hoc* contributions by the people. As a result, considerable development expenditure has been incurred in these areas. The average annual development expenditure incurred *per capita* in these areas ranges from over Rs. 3/- in Bodhan to only Re. 0·50 in Morsi. The distribution of blocks according to *per capita* development expenditure is as follows:

Development Expenditure (*Per capita*)	No.	Blocks
More than Rs. 3.00	1	Bodhan.
Rs. 2.00 to Rs. 3.00	3	Bhadrak, Sonepat and Mandya.
Re. 1.00 to Rs. 2.00	7	Bhathat, Pusa, Erode, Kolhapur, Rajpur, Cachar and Batala.
Below Re. 1.00	2	Morsi and Chalakudy.

The proportionate contribution made by the panchayats to the development expenditure is rather small—less than 20% of the total—in 7 out of the 13 blocks. In three blocks, Sonepat, Chalakudy and Morsi, however, it is quite high ranging between 70 and 90 per cent of the total.

*The figures of administrative expenditure used for this table do not include expenses on the Panchayat Secretary, where (as in U.P.) these are met by the State Government.

Ad hoc *contributions from the People*

The government grants have made it possible in most of the blocks to raise substantial *ad hoc* resources from the people. In some blocks, such *ad hoc* contributions are much higher than the contributions of the panchayats. The limitations of the figures of the people's *ad hoc* contribution given mainly in the form of labour, materials, land etc. are well known. However, keeping these limitations in mind, it is interesting to compare them with (i) the panchayat's contributions and (ii) their internal resources.

Sl. No.	Block-State	% of total development expenditure contributed by		*Ad hoc* contribution from people as % of panchayat contribution	*Ad hoc* contribution from people as % of self raised income of panchayats
		Total popular participation*	Total Government participation**		
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad)	22.8	77.2	177.6	33.9
2	Cachar (Assam)	28.7	71.3	300.2	77.8
3	Pusa (Bihar)	53.1	46.9	48.9	32.7
4	Kolhapur (Bombay)	61.6	38.4	245.8	56.1
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra)	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
6	Morsi (M.P.)	92.2	7.8	2.6	1.3
7	Erode (Madras)	31.3	68.7	4.6	1.4
8	Rajpur (M.B.)	41.0	59.0	464.6	98.3
9	Bhadrak (Orissa)	12.9	87.1	2,090.4	191.0
10	Batala (Punjab)	40.7	59.3	16.7	13.6
11	Sonepat (Punjab)	85.4	14.6	19.1	27.3
12	Chalakudy (Kerala)	86.1	13.9	6.0	5.6
13	Bhathat (U.P.)	76.0	24.0	310.8	471.6
14	Mandya (Mysore)	77.5	22.5	718.4	N.A.
15	Ashta (Bhopal)	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

*Panchayat's contribution plus people's *ad hoc* contribution.

**Project contribution plus *ad hoc* government contribution.

It will be seen that in a number of blocks the *ad hoc* contributions raised from the people were much larger than those made by the panchayats. Further, in at least a few blocks notably Cachar (Assam), Bhadrak (Orissa), Bhathat (U.P.) and Mandya (Mysore) the *ad hoc* contributions were higher than the normal resources of the panchayats. The figures underline the importance of the resources

raised for specific purposes. The method has some similarity to the traditional method of raising funds for works in the villages. The people are called upon to contribute, on individual occasions, to the implementation of specific concrete project of common interest. There is a 'direct appeal' to their imagination and they seem to respond to it much more readily than when they are required to make regular contribution, by way of taxes, for the execution of the normal humdrum duties of the panchayats. The technique has been used with advantage during the project period. It would be well-worth considering whether this technique should not be exploited more widely to strengthen popular institutions at least until the time the people are willing to pay the panchayat taxes more fully and regularly.

Functioning of Panchayats

The panchayats in all States have been entrusted with a long list of functions and duties covering the entire field of civic administration and of social and economic development of the villages. Sanitation of the village; pavement of village lanes and drains; street lighting; provision of drinking water facilities; provision of elementary medical facilities and measures for control and prevention of epidemic diseases; education of children; adult literacy; establishment of recreation centres, youth clubs and mahila samities; and maintenance of vital statistics are some of the important functions assigned to the panchayats. They are also expected to lay down cultivation standards; to arrange for the supply of improved seeds and manures; to take measures for reclamation of waste lands; to provide irrigation facilities and for conservation of soil and water; to assist in consolidation of holdings and in general, to take all steps for increasing agricultural production in the village. They are expected to promote co-operation, and co-operative farming, and develop cottage industries to the extent possible. They, along with the village co-operative are expected to be the main agency for the planning and execution of all developmental programmes in the village and to act as channels for government assistance. As the process of rural development gathers momentum and the State becomes increasingly associated with development programmes, it is visualised that the role of panchayats in the field of economic development will become increasingly important. The question of collection of land revenue and maintenance of revenue records by the panchayats is also one which has been under active consideration in most States. The State of Saurashtra had entrusted these functions to the 'A' & 'B' class panchayats. In States like U.P. and Bihar also, collection of land revenue by panchayats has been tried on a limited scale. In a number of States the panchayats have been given regulatory or administrative functions. In Bihar and Orissa the watch and ward functions formerly discharged by the Police Department have been transferred to the panchayats; while in Uttar Pradesh and in the State of Saurashtra the panchayats are required to raise a village volunteer force for the protection of the village. In a number of States, one of the most important functions of the panchayat is to dispense civil and criminal justice. The working of panchayats as judicial bodies has not, however, been studied in this enquiry, which is concerned primarily with their functioning as development institutions.

In the Acts of most States a distinction is made between obligatory and discretionary functions of panchayats. This distinction is not of much practical significance, however, because nowhere is it insisted that the panchayats will first discharge their obligatory functions before taking up the discretionary ones. The list of functions has become a permissive list in actual practice, from which the panchayats can take up whatever activity they like.

The functioning of the panchayats selected for this study is described in the following paragraphs. It would be proper to emphasise here that these panchayats have been functioning under exceptionally favourable conditions. The areas of the former community projects (13 out of the 15 blocks selected for the study are such areas) got an unusual concentration of development funds and staff, which it has not been possible to duplicate elsewhere. Even the present community development blocks have much less funds and staffs than these projects. For most of the activities described in the following paragraphs, project assistance—often quite liberal—has been available. Consequently, the activities undertaken by these panchayats are considerably more than might be expected from panchayats elsewhere and the limitations and difficulties faced by them in attaining a higher level of activity might well be expected to be experienced in much greater degree in other areas.*

Activities of Panchayats

Table 7 shows the activities undertaken by the panchayats selected for this study. The main activities undertaken directly by one or more panchayats in different areas are: lighting and sweeping of streets; pavement of streets and construction of drains; provision of drinking water facilities; improvement of communications ; construction of buildings for schools and community centres, and organisation of social education activities like libraries, adult literacy centres, recreation centres, vikas mandals, melas, bhajan mandalies etc.

Provision of Civic Amenities

Lighting and sweeping of village streets:—Street lighting is being done in all selected panchayats in Bodhan (Hyderabad), Manavadar (Saurashtra) and Chalakudy (Kerala). In Kolhapur (Bombay), Pusa (Bihar), Morsi (M.P.), Erode (Madras) and Bhathat (U.P.), this activity is being done by only one or two panchayats. In Bhathat the panchayats have met only the capital expenditure towards the installation of street lamps but the expenses on kerosene oil, etc., are expected to be met by the people. This arrangement is not working satisfactorily and the lamps are lighted only rarely.

Arrangements for sweeping of village streets have been made in all the panchayats studied in Bodhan, Chalakudy and Manavadar, and in 4 out of the 6 panchayats in Kolhapur, 3 out of the 4 panchayats in Rajpur and 2 out of 4 in Sonepat. These panchayats employ sweeper to carry out the work regularly. In Pusa, there is

*While this is generally true, it is possible that in individual States, the panchayats in the evaluation centre may, for some special reasons, be less active than in other parts of the State. Thus it is reported that the panchyats in some of the Western Districts are much more active than those of the evaluation centre which is located in one of the poorer Eastern Districts of the State.

no regular arrangement, but in 3 out of 4 selected panchayats cleanliness drives were organised from time to time. Arrangement for regular sweeping of streets assumes special importance after pavement of streets and construction of drains has been taken up in a village, because adequate benefits cannot be otherwise derived from these facilities. These improvements were made with assistance from project funds in most of the panchayats in the Punjab blocks and also in a few in Kolhapur, Rajpur and Bhathat. But, in many cases, the panchayats have not been able to make arrangements for sweeping.

Provision of drinking water facilities:—Some activity in improving drinking water facilities has been undertaken by one or more panchayats in all blocks except Bodhan, Kolhapur and Mandya. In Batala all panchayats have taken up this activity.

Smokeless Chulhas and Latrines:—Construction of latrines has been undertaken by some panchayats in Bodhan, Pusa and Rajpur. Three panchayats in Batala and one in Rajpur are reported to have promoted construction of smokeless chulhas in village homes. It may be mentioned that both these are important project activities for improving the level of living, but so far success has been modest.

Improvement of communications

Construction and repair of village approach roads has been taken up by most of the panchayats. 40 out of 56 panchayats have reported this activity. This is the largest number for any single activity. It may be recalled that this was a very important activity in the early phases of the community projects and great stress was laid on popular participation, especially in the form of labour. The activity is reported to have been undertaken by all panchayats in Pusa, Rajpur, Batala, Chalakudy and Bhathat and one or more panchayats in all the other centres.

Construction of Community buildings

Construction of school buildings has been reported from 16 out of the 56 reporting panchayats. In Batala, all the five panchayats are reported to have taken up this work for which assistance was available from the project. In a number of other centres also, namely, Pusa, Rajpur, Bhathat and Sonepat all panchayats have undertaken it. Construction and repair of *panchayat ghars*, on the other hand, has been taken up by only one panchayat in Manavadar.

Social Education Activities

The panchayats have taken initiative in organising such activities as community recreation centres, libraries, purchase of radio sets, youth clubs, mahila samities, vikas mandals, melas, bhajan mandalies etc. The community centre and library seem to be the most popular. They exist in as many as 26 panchayats. The number is particularly high in Kolhapur, Morsi, Rajpur, Batala and Chalakudy. Adult literacy centres have been organised by 3 panchayats in Batala and 2 in Pusa. For the rest, these centres as also youth clubs and mahila samities have been organised by only a few panchayats here and there.

Economic Development Activities

In 3 blocks *viz.*, Manavadar, Bhadrak and Chalakudy some panchayats are reported to have taken the initiative in providing irrigation facilities. In Manavadar, one panchayat took up the work and collected a sum of Rs. 2,000 for the construction of a bund for storing rain water. In Chalakudy, maintenance and repair of bunds is a routine activity of the panchayats, funds for which are provided by the government. In Bhadrak, a tube-well was constructed in the area of one panchayat. But the panchayat played no part; the funds were provided by the government and the work was executed by a contractor. Three panchayats took some initiative in promoting cottage industries. In Manavadar, one of the panchayats sanctioned Rs. 800 for starting an Ambar Charkha Centre. In Pusa also, such a centre is being run by one of the panchayats. In Batala one panchayat organised demonstration parties for rope and mat making.

Land Management

The panchayats have shown no initiative in reclaiming wastelands or in soil conservation. Even in Punjab and U.P., where the panchayats have been given the management of village common land, no panchayat took the initiative either in reclaiming any part of the land or augmenting its productive capacity. It has been reported by the PEOs, especially of the two Punjab centres that the panchayats could increase the productive capacity of the land and their own income substantially, if they adopted suitable measures like reclamation of culturable waste, controlled grazing and afforestation, stocking the ponds with fish etc. Management of such lands has so far consisted merely in renting out the cultivable part to individual cultivators. Even this had not been possible in some cases, where panchayats have had difficulties in obtaining possession of the lands. These difficulties have been particularly serious in U.P., but have been experienced in some of the Punjab panchayats also. In most of the panchayats studied in the Gorakhpur district block of this state, the village common land is scattered in several bits. The panchayat does not have a full knowledge of the location and extent of its land which is often unlawfully occupied by villagers. In fact, taking possession of this land has been the major problem for 2 out of the 6 panchayats studied. If the Sabhapati decides to take legal action against the offending parties, not only does he become unpopular with the villagers, but he has also to be prepared to engage himself in the time consuming and expensive processes of the law. The members and Sabhapatis of the panchayats are not well educated and do not understand the legal technicalities involved in the discharge of their functions. Moreover, few panchayats can mobilize the financial resources and few Sabhapatis wish to spare the time that is needed for the legal process, with the result that they do not get possession of their land. Thus the panchayats not only lose a source of revenue, but also their prestige in the eyes of the people. The situation often creates two groups in the village, one of which benefits illegally from the illegal possession of the common property and is naturally interested in seeing that the panchayat remains weak. Thus in one of the panchayat villages studied by us where this situation existed, there was no enthusiasm for any development activity. Similarly, it

was noticed in the Sonepat block in Punjab that in one village where some people with influence had illegally occupied the panchayat land, no development activity could be undertaken.

Both in Punjab and Uttar Pradesh the village committee for consolidation of holdings includes panchayat members, as well as others. An active panchayat is generally recognized to be helpful for the effective functioning of these committees, though as in one village in Sonepat (Punjab) the Sarpanch used his position of influence to favour the members of his group in the allotment of lands.

None of the panchayats studied are reported to have taken any initiative in organising agricultural supplies *e.g.* of seed and manures, in arranging credit or in popularising any improved practices. It is claimed in some States, notably Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Saurashtra, that the panchayats have been associated with the drawing up of developmental plans for the villages. In the few panchayats covered by this study, however, such association, even if it was there, must have been superficial, for it has not led to any noteworthy effort for agricultural improvement in the villages nor created any particular consciousness about the village plan among the villagers.

Promotion of co-operation is another important objective set down for the panchayats. Co-operative societies exist in most of the panchayat villages included in this study. But no instance of active relationship between the two institutions has come to notice. Frequently, a number of persons belong to both the institutions. But they function as individual members and there is no link between the two institutions.

Attitude towards Panchayats

In order to obtain some idea of the people's attitude towards this institution, a number of questions were asked of all respondents, knowledgeable and non-knowledgeable. The more important questions are: collection of taxes by the panchayats, increasing the income of the panchayats; the usefulness of panchayats to the villagers; the kind of assistance needed to make the institution more effective, and whether the institution should have certain specified powers and duties like collection of land revenue.

Before interpreting the answers received, it is necessary to state their limitations. There are two main difficulties. First, on issues like panchayat taxes, it is sometimes difficult to know the respondents' true feeling. Thus a respondent who is a member of the panchayat would be rather hesitant to say that he is opposed to the panchayat levying more taxes. The second difficulty which arises from lack of knowledge or experience is even greater, because in this case it is difficult for the respondent fully to comprehend the question. It will have been clear from the preceding sections that the impact of the panchayats on the general population of the villages has been very small; that in most areas the people do not realise what the institution can do, and that even among the members there is a very inadequate understanding of the functions of the panchayats. Accordingly replies to questions like what the panchayat

should do, what more powers or functions it should have, are not as clear as they would have been if the panchayat have had a stronger impact on the people. This is especially true of the replies to a rather difficult question like whether the panchayat should maintain revenue records or collect land revenue. In considering the replies to these last questions it should be kept in mind that only the respondents in one centre—Manavadar (Saurashtra), had any actual experience.

Attitude towards taxes

Data on the attitude towards panchayat taxes are set down in Table 8. The respondent was asked two questions : (i) what taxes should be levied by the panchayats, and (ii) what taxes are generally resented by the village people. The answer to the second question may well reflect the respondents own feeling rather than that of the mass of the villagers. Many respondents who do not like panchayat taxes but do not wish to say so openly, have expressed their feeling by saying that these taxes are unpopular with the villagers. The replies however, tally with the general observations made by the Project Evaluation Officers. It is to be further noted that in reply to both questions, a much larger number of non-knowledgeable than the knowledgeable respondents reported that the taxes are not liked. The knowledgeable group consists of people who have understanding of working of the institution and also some interest. On the other hand the non-knowledgeable represent more faithfully the general population of the village.

The data have been analysed in respect of 4 important taxes; house tax, land cess, licence fees and labour tax.

House Tax.—This tax is levied in 9 out of 15 blocks. Among knowledgeable respondents there is little or no resistance to this tax. In only one block, as many as 15% of the knowledgeable respondents said that they were themselves opposed to this tax. In other blocks opposition comes from a very few individuals. On the other hand, among the non-knowledgeable, there is appreciable opposition in several blocks notably Sonepat and Batala in (Punjab), Bodhan (Hyderabad) and Rajpur (Madhya Bharat). In response to the second question, a very large number of respondents in all blocks except Mandya (Mysore) and Kolhapur (Bombay) stated that the taxes were disliked by the people.

Land Cess.—Land cess, which is a surcharge on land revenue, is levied in four blocks Morsi (M.P.), Chalakudy (Kerala), Bhathat (U.P.) and Ashta (Bhopal). There is no appreciable resistance to this tax because it is collected as part of the land revenue. The reaction to this tax shows that the people are more opposed to paying taxes imposed by the Panchayat than by higher bodies. It is the nearness of the tax imposing authority which affects their attitude.

Licence fees.—Licence fees are levied in 8 blocks—Bodhan, Cachar, Kolhapur, Morsi Erode, Bhadrak, Chalakudy and Bhathat. But as these have to be paid by a few people like shopkeepers, or as in Erode, these

are a surcharge on existing stamp duties, they do not evoke any general resistance. These fees contribute substantially to the revenue of panchayats, only in two blocks, Erode and Bhathat. In other cases they are unimportant. It is interesting to note that some resistance to these duties is noticed in these two blocks :—

	Erode (Madras)	Bhathat (U.P.)
Percentage of respondents reporting people's resistance	38.0	31.3
Percentage of respondents reporting their own resistance —		
Knowledgeable	..	13.5
Non-knowledgeable	19.4	10.0
TOTAL	8.5	11.9

Labour Tax.—Labour tax for community works undertaken by panchayats is levied in a few centres, notably Pusa, Rajpur and Ashta. There is no resistance to the tax in Rajpur, the data of the other two blocks where such levy is made are not sufficient for drawing any conclusion. However, in case of the Pusa Block, it is reported by the P.E.O. that resistance to labour tax comes mostly from landless labourers who cannot afford to work without wages even for a single day, and that there is no resistance from the well-to-do cultivators who can make payment in cash in lieu of labour.

The response to the question on whether panchayats should levy more taxes was by no means enthusiastic. Only 233 respondents or 21·6% of the total replied in the affirmative. The figures for the knowledgeable and the non-knowledgeable persons are 32.4% and 11·1% respectively. It is obvious that the respondents and especially the non-knowledgeable respondents, do not favour further imposition of taxes by the panchayats. The respondents who replied to this question in the affirmative were further asked what additional taxes should be levied by the panchayats. An analysis of their replies shows that in most cases they suggested taxes which were the important sources of panchayat revenue in other areas, but were not being levied in their areas. Thus, imposition of house tax or property tax which is already one of the most important sources of panchayat tax in a number of blocks is suggested by appreciable numbers of respondents in three blocks—Pusa, Morsi and Rajpur, where it is not being levied at present. Similarly taxes on professions, vendors or traders which are also important sources of panchayat revenue in some areas, have been suggested in a number of blocks. Two suggestions *viz.*, tax on bicycles and tax on electricity are interesting, because these indicate the rural people's awareness of the new patterns of consumption and rise in the level of living, and the possibility of taxing the newer items of consumption.

Suggestions for Augmenting the Resources of the Panchayats

The respondents were also asked a more general question on how the income of the panchayats could be increased. The response to this question was much more enthusiastic. 470 respondents or 44·3% of the total replied to it. Among the knowledgeable respondents, the proportion was as high as 72% but among the non-know-

ledgeable respondents, it was only 28%. The analysis of the replies presented in Table 9 shows that in a number of areas there was a general impression that panchayat revenues could be greatly increased by proper realisation of taxes and utilization of the other resources at the disposal of the panchayats. Two steps were suggested in this connection : (i) proper enforcement of present taxes, and (ii) proper management of lands and other resources available to the panchayats. In Pusa and Bodhan, the majority of respondents felt that income could be increased by proper enforcement of present taxes. In Sonepat, Batala, Bhathat and Ashta where the panchayats have common lands, large numbers of respondents favoured better management of these lands and also made suggestions like development of fishing, planting fruit trees, etc. In one case, Morsi, the majority of the respondents wanted allotment of government waste lands to panchayats to help to raise the income. There was also a feeling in some areas (*e.g.*, Bhadrak, Mandya and Chalakudy) that the panchayats should levy some kind of an income tax. Another important suggestion which has been made by respondents in three blocks Cachar, Batala and Manavadar is that the panchayats should collect contributions from the people. It has been explained above that collection of *ad hoc* contributions for specific purposes was perhaps the most important traditional method of undertaking community works in a number of areas and that the method has been employed with advantage by the project staff in many of these blocks. These answers suggest that the people in at least a few blocks feel that the method could be used more extensively.

Another very interesting point emerging from this analysis is that suggestions for augmenting resources and even for increasing taxes are in general forthcoming more actively from those blocks where the panchayats have shown some activity and mobilised some resources. Thus Kolhapur, Morsi, Batala and Pusa are blocks of comparatively active response. At the other end, in centres like Bhathat, Cachar and Bhadrak where the panchayats are not functioning actively and the resources mobilised by them at present are very meagre, the response is rather poor. The correlation is by no means perfect, but the fact that in a number of blocks where panchayats have shown activity and mobilised resources, a large number of people want it to do more and if necessary even to share more burdens is a fact of great significance. It shows that the very fact of effective functioning of the institutions for some time might prove a powerful stimulus to further progress.

Usefulness of Panchayats

The response to the general question, on whether the panchayats have been useful to them is summarisd in the following figures :—

Sl. No.	Block/State	Percentage of Respondents reporting panchayats as		
		Useful	Not Useful	No Reply
1	2	3	4	5
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad)	96·4	3·7	Nil
2	Cachar (Assam)	47·9	35·4	16·7

1	2	3	4	5
3	Pusa (Bihar)	79·7	14·5	5·8
4	Kolhapur (Bombay)	42·2	56·7	1·0
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra)	92·1	3·9	3·9
6	Morsi (M.P.)	72·5	27·5	Nil
7	Erode (Madras)	84·5	14·1	1·4
8	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat)	80·4	15·9	3·7
9	Bhadrak (Orissa)	74·0	24·0	2·0
10	Batala (Punjab)	91·9	8·1	Nil
11	Sonepat (Punjab)	86·5	10·8	2·7
12	Chalakudy (Kerala)	80·0	19·2	0·8
13	Bhathat (U.P.)	98·5	Nil	1·1
14	Mandya (Mysore)	49·0	34·0	17·0
15	Ashta (Bhopal)	64·6	34·3	1·1
	TOTAL	74·9	21·9	3·1

It will be seen that the majority of the respondents are of the view that the panchayats have been of some use. The number of those not finding the panchayats useful or not giving any response is much larger among the non-knowledgeable than among the knowledgeable respondents. 28% of the non-knowledgeable respondents have given this reaction towards the institution and another 5% have given no reply. Thus, among the category which represents the ordinary villagers, there is a considerable section which does not consider the panchayats useful. Again, with the exception of Kolhapur all the blocks in which large numbers of respondents (20% or more) do not find the panchayats useful are those in which the panchayats are largely ineffective. Panchayats in Kolhapur have some activity to their credit and the response might only be an expression of a very conscious population that the panchayats are not doing as they could.

Suggestions for Improving the Functioning of Panchayats

The suggestions given by respondents for improving the functioning of the panchayats which are summarised in the following figures are also of considerable interest.

No. of Blocks studied: 15

Total No. of Respondents interviewed : 1080

No. of Respondents reporting : 695

Sl. No.	Suggestions	No. of blocks reporting	No. of respondents resporting	Percentage of respondents reporting to total No. of respondents in reporting blocks
1	2	3	4	5
1	Frequent inspection by panchayat officer	15	337	48.5
2	Frequent meetings of panchayat and the village community	15	333	47.3
3	Panchayat should not associate itself with politics	10	69	15.6
4	Appointment of educated, trained, full-time secretary	8	57	12.6
5	Unanimity in decisions	9	56	11.4
6	Proper auditing of accounts	4	41	18.6

The replies to this question give an indication of the people's interest in the institution, so that the overall percentage of 64% respondents giving some suggestion for improvement is heartening. There is very great inter-block variation in this respect from a high of 98·7% in Batala to a low of only 4·56% in Bhathat. In an earlier section, it has been commented that inspection of panchayats and guidance to them are inadequate almost everywhere. It appears that this feeling is shared by a large majority of the people in the panchayat areas. The second suggestion that there should be frequent meetings between the panchayat and the village body shows that the people feel the need for greater contact between the panchayat executive and the village community. A large number of respondents in Kolhapur, Erode and Mandya have favoured such meetings. In these centres, there is no provision for such meetings in the Panchayat Act. But the suggestion is also made significantly enough in the Punjab Centres—Batala and Sonepat. Provision for such meetings exists in these centres, but the meetings are reported to have failed to arouse the interest of the people.

In Kolhapur, a number of respondents feel that the panchayats should not take part in politics as this is the major difficulty of some panchayats in this block. But it is interesting that in Chalakudy where panchayat elections are contested on party lines the number of respondents favouring dissociation of panchayats from politics is much smaller. In other blocks, the respondents do not seem to be concerned about the panchayats' involvement in politics.

In Rajpur where the panchayat secretaries are generally school teachers attending to this work in addition to their duties, a large number of respondents feel that the panchayats should have educated, trained and full-time secretaries. In Erode, where the relations

between the panchayat presidents and members are reported to be not very cordial, several respondents have suggested that the decisions of the panchayat should be unanimous. A similar suggestion has also been made in Batala. A large number of respondents in both the Punjab blocks have suggested that panchayat accounts should be properly audited. The fact that respondents from other blocks have not made this suggestion, does not indicate that arrangements for auditing are more satisfactory there. In most cases, people do not care since the panchayat have not mobilised any appreciable funds from the people.

The respondents were further asked to mention what type of assistance was most needed for improving the functioning of the panchayats. The first and second priority replies given by respondents are shown in Table 12.

The majority of the respondents have assigned first or second priority to financial aid. In 7 of the 14 centres, Batala, Morsi, Bhadrak, Sonepat, Mandya, Chalakudy and Bodhan, large majority of the respondents feel that the panchayats should get more financial assistance from the government. It may be noted that in most of these centres the panchayats are already getting assistance from the government. On the other hand in Rajpur and Bhathat where panchayats have little resources and do not get any assistance from the government (apart from the latter paying the salary of the secretary) very few respondents have replied to this question or asked for financial aid. This again shows that interest in panchayats, consciousness of what they can do and how they can be helped to do it, depends in large part upon the experience which people have had of these institutions.

As regards the form of technical aid, the majority of the respondents indicate the need for guidance from engineering staff in the execution of community works. Preference for administrative aid as the first or second priority has been indicated by 23·8% of the respondents. The number is particularly large in Manavadar block (62·7%) where the panchayats have revenue functions Better supervision of panchayats by government officials; better co-ordination between the panchayats and government departments, and proper training of secretaries and members of panchayats are forms of administrative assistance most frequently mentioned by respondents.

The respondents' reactions to the question whether panchayats should have more powers are brought out in Table 13. As indicated earlier, these responses have a very limited significance, because in most cases, the respondents have had no experience of panchayats actually exercising such powers. For example, in case of compulsory levy of labour, only the panchayats in Pusa (Bihar), Rajpur (Madhya Bharat) and Astha (Bhopal) have got these powers at present. The attitude in all the three centres is favourable to panchayats having the power to levy tax. But this attitude does not accord well with the actual experience of the collection of this tax which has not been satisfactory in any of these centres. In a number of other centres also, the majority of the respondents are in favour of panchayats

having the power of compulsory levy of labour tax. But in two centres Erode and Manavadar, all the respondents and in another two Bodhan and Chalakudy the majority of them are opposed to panchayats having such powers.

48% of all the respondents are in favour of the panchayats collecting land revenue. The proportion favouring panchayats maintaining land records is still lower *i.e.* 37·7%. In both cases, it may be noted that in 8 out of the 15 blocks, the majority of the people are either opposed to panchayats collecting land revenue or have not given any reply. As regards panchayats maintaining land records, this position obtains in 12 out of the 15 blocks, and in only 3—Mandya, Pusa and Bhathat—the majority of the respondents are in favour. It may be added that in cases of both collection of land revenue and maintenance of revenue records, a higher percentage of knowledgeable respondents is in favour of the panchayats assuming these duties. Among the non-knowledgeable respondents, a very large number have not given any response to these two questions which is understandable in view of the fact that in most cases there is no experience of the panchayats undertaking either of these duties. Appreciable experience of panchayats doing these two duties is available only in Manavadar (Saurashtra) where the A & B class panchayats were associated with this work. Here a majority of respondents favour the panchayats continuing to have both these duties.

About 2/3rd (66%) of all the respondents are in favour of the panchayats serving as the main agency for channelling government assistance. But there is substantial opposition or indifference to this in some blocks notably Cachar, Manavadar, Mandya and Erode. The figures for respondents reporting in favour in these blocks are ·29·2%, 2·0%, 49:1% and 38% respectively. But the reply from Manavadar is very intersting in view of the fact that the Saurashtra Government had been giving very liberal, almost lavish assistance to the panchayats.

Chapter V

BLOCK RECORDS

Introduction

In April 1956, the Third Evaluation Report commented that while awareness of the importance of records was growing steadily, the records at the level of the Gram Sevak were not being maintained properly. The relevant concepts were not properly defined in some cases, nor were the standards carefully prescribed, with the result that the methods of recording accomplishments were not uniform, and the figures for different blocks not strictly comparable. Further, there was lack of regular and thorough check of the records by the supervisory officers. The feeling was growing that accomplishment figures reported by B. D. Os. which subsequently figure in the statistics of Community Development Ministry were inflated. This could happen because of the inadequate checking on the spot. Moreover, the number of blocks covered by the C. D. and the N. E.S. has now increased to more than 2,000. This has, obviously, made more imperative than before the problem of properly maintaining records which serve as tools for development planning and as barometer of the progress achieved. The Programme Evaluation Organisation, accordingly, undertook a detailed enquiry to find out the type of records maintained ; the coverage of the performance figures reported ; the levels at which these figures were maintained ; the extent to which they were checked by the B. D. O., the Extension Specialist concerned and the Progress Assistant, where there was one ; the type of checks that were made ; the periodicity with which they were made ; the directives from the State Governments to the B. D. Os. ; and the efforts made by the Progress Assistant to improve the statistics. The enquiry was limited to those items which are at present used by the C.D. Ministry as progress indicators and data for which are reported quarterly by the B. D. O. to the State headquarter.

The enquiry was conducted during January-February, 1958 and data collected for 19 blocks, one each in 19 evaluation centres. These 19 blocks belong mostly to the early 1952-53 series,* which, as we have already noted, received the greatest attention and it is unlikely that records are better maintained and field checking done more efficiently elsewhere, though in some of these evaluation centres the maintenance of the records has been complicated by the splitting up of the original blocks into several post intensive phase blocks.

Maintenance of Records

The basic records maintained by the Gram Sevak at present can be broadly classified into three categories—(i) those which deal with primary data relating to *his own activities,* the routine reporting of which started purely as an administrative requirement (like daily diary, seed, fertilizer, demonstration registers, etc.) ; (ii) those which deal with primary data collected by him in relation to *activities in the area* (not necessarily his own) and were required for the quarterly progress reports of the C. D. Ministry or the State Planning

*Four blocks which had been N.E.S. originally were converted into C.D. blocks, two in April 1955 and two in April, 1956.

Department, *e.g.* the monthly progress report, the village survey report and other information at the village level ; and (iii) those which deal with information flowing from the block headquarter to him, *viz.*, the target register and records of loans and works. The targets are derived from the block figures and not built up from below.

Though the records of the first category vary widely, in form and content, in different blocks, they are being generally maintained. In three centres out of 19 under study—Bhadrak (Orissa), Manavadar (Bombay, former Saurashtra) and Kakinada (Andhra), Gram Sevaks did not maintain the diary. The practice, however, differs in respect or the submission of the diaries to the block office for scrutiny and inspection ; two blocks Bassi (Rajasthan) and Ashta (Madhya Pradesh) reported that the Gram Sevaks were not submitting the diaries to the B. D. Os. Again both the number of registers and their contents vary from block to block ; in some blocks a separate register is maintained for each sub-activity, while in others more than one activity are recorded in a single register.

The records of the second category also, particularly the monthly progress report, are now maintained generally. But the way they are maintained is much less uniform than is the case with the diary. Sometimes, as in Erode (Madras), no progress record is maintained at the Gram Sevak's headquarter ; but at the fortnightly meeting the B. D. O. gets him to fill up 'village improvement sheets' which remain at B. D. O.'s headquarters. Reports from only 9 out of 19 centres clearly indicate that the Gram Sevak maintains monthly progress registers which are submitted to the B. D. O. for checking. The progress records also differ in respect of their content. Sometimes they show only the Gram Sevak's own achievement and not the total achievement in his circle. The B. D. Os use the records submitted by or obtained from the Gram Sevaks to prepare their quarterly progress reports to the State Government. In some instances, however, as in Malavalli (Mysore), where the Gram Sevak reports only on his own activity, the B. D. O. obtains directly from the District Officers data on departmental activity and includes them in his quarterly report. The target records, which fall in the third category, are being maintained in only a few centres.

The enquiry has also revealed that very often the Gram Sevak does not hand over the records maintained by him to his successor at the time of his transfer with the result that the records are lost for ever and the new comer is put at great disadvantage.

Concepts and Standards

The primary purpose of the records which are to be kept by the Gram Sevak is to provide material for checking the progress made in his circle. For this report we have analysed only 10 progress indicators—6 for the field of agriculture and 4 for construction. These progress indicators are based on certain concepts, and it is useful to see how uniformly these are applied. For this purpose data were collected for a few items *viz.*, improved seeds, the Japanese method and compost pits. In the case of improved seeds while 4 blocks report only the nucleus seeds from department or project, 8 blocks include, in addition, seeds from registered growers, progressive farmers and private nurseries and there is no guarantee that the seeds from these

diverse sources are of the same quality. Another 4 blocks take into account also the natural spread. Again, a farmer is reported as following the Japanese method though he may not be using all the processes recommended. Only in 4 blocks out of the 19 under study, the method seems to have been fully followed while in 5 only line sowing and use of fertilizers have been taken as the Japanese method. In 3 blocks, line sowing has not been adopted though some other processes are being used. One block reports areas under the Japanese method though only dibbling is being done. In the case of compost pits, very often the pit does not conform to the standard size and is yet reported as a compost pit. The processes of sectional filling, turning and moistening are seldom done. In fact, in some cases even if no pits are dug and the cow-dung is just piled up on the ground, the operation is considered as composting. Distinction between new pits and pits already existing is not always kept in mind with the result that the figures are duplicated. In some centres as in Pusa (Bihar), old pits continue to be reported even if they no longer exist, or as in Chalakudy (Kerala) a compost pit which is used a second time is reported as a new pit.

Coverage of progress indicators

Coverage of the figures for these indicators is also difficult to interpret. According to the instructions of the C. D. Ministry, figures in the quarterly progress reports for the indicators listed should give the entire achievement in the block area, whether it is the result of efforts of the project authority or the normal department or private enterprise. In practice, the coverage reported varies from block to block; it may relate to the project activity only, project plus departmental activity or project, departmental plus private activity. The following table gives the numbers of centres where figures of an item are reported with specified coverage and also shows whether the coverage is complete or otherwise.

Sl. No.	Progress indicators	No. of blocks in which the programme is being implemented by				Lowest level at which performance figures are maintained		
		Project only	Department only	Project and Deptt. only	Project, Deptt. and private	Block	Gram Sevak level	Village level
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Chemical fertilizers distributed . . .	7(1)			5	6	0	
2	Improved seeds distributed	10(4)	0(1)	4	0	3	12	4
3	Area under Japanese method of cultivation .	13(0)	0	2	0	3	5	7
4	Agricultural demonstrations held . .	15(1)	0	3	0	5	10	4

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5	Net area under irrigation	2(2)	6	3	0	6	3	4
6	Waste & virgin land reclaimed	6(0)	1	2	4	4	6	3
7	Drinking water wells constructed	12(4)	0	2	1	10	5	4
8	Community centres started	16(1)	0	0	0	7	6	4
9	New roads constructed .	12(5)	0	2	0	10	4	5

The figures in cols. 3 to 6 except those in brackets refer to blocks for which the B.D.O's report is complete in respect of coverage. Those within brackets refer to blocks in which besides the authority mentioned, other also were engaged in the activity, but were not reported by the B. D. O. In the case of chemical fertilizers, reports of five centres, contain information on performance relating to project, departmental and private effort, while in seven centres they refer only to the project activity and in two others to the departmental activity only. In all these cases there are no omissions and the reporting is full. In case of seeds, drinking water wells and roads, however, a good many centres report only the share of the project authority but not that of the department or of private enterprise though the latter two also contributed.

Cols. 7 to 9 give the lowest level at which the primary figures of performance are maintained in different blocks. In good many instances *e.g.* improved seeds, agricultural demonstrations, the lowest level at which figures are maintained is that of the Gram Sevak circle while the block is the lowest level for quite a few cases of drinking water wells and roads. Only in the case of the Japanese method of paddy cultivation, the figures are more often maintained at the village level, than at that of the block or Gram Sevak. For all the items taken together, the data are maintained most frequently at the Gram Sevak level. This is not fully consistent with the emphasis laid on village and family planning.

The C. D. Ministry has also recommended the maintenance of target figures in addition to those on performance. 9 centres, in fact, maintain no target figures for the area under irrigation and new roads constructed. For land reclamation, drinking water wells and community centres only 5, 8 and 5 centres respectively maintain the relevant target figures; others do not do so. Even where figures are maintained, we do not know whether the targets are realistically determined. In certain cases, it has been found that the target figure and performance figure do not have the same coverage. For chemical fertilizers, for example, two centres report performance figures which cover both project and departmental effort while the target figures refer to the project effort only. This results in boosting up the present achievement in relation to the target. In another 2 centres while the target figure is determined in relation to project and department efforts, the performance figure reported quarterly pertains to the project only. Similar discrepancy between the coverage of the

target and the performance figures is noticed in three centres for new roads constructed, in one case the target relates to the project only while performance figures cover both project and the departmental achievement.

Extent of checking

The table below shows the number of centres where performance figures for 10 indicators are checked ; data are given separately for achievement resulting from project and departmental activity.

Sl. No.	Progress indicators	No. of blocks not reporting	Project part		Departmental part	
			Checked	Not checked	Checked	Not checked
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Chemical fertilizers distributed .	0	12	4	6	3
2	Improved seeds distributed . .	0	16	2	4	1
3	Area under Japanese method of cultivation	4	12	3	2	0
4	Agricultural demonstrations held .	0	17	2	2	1
5	Net area under irrigation . .	4	3	4	5	4
6	Waste and virgin land reclaimed .	6	2	10	3	4
7	Drinking water wells constructed .	0	18	1	1	1
8	Community Centres started .	2	15	2	0	0
9	New roads constructed . .	0	13	6	2	0
10	Existing roads improved . .	4	8	7	1	1

The area reclaimed, the area under irrigation and the improvement of existing roads seem to be the items least checked both for the project and departmental activity. Three B. D. Os out of the 12 who reported on the performance figures for area reclaimed, considered them unreliable. Items like drinking water wells, community centres, which can be checked easily fare better, but the checking of new roads constructed is much worse. Six out of the 19 centres report no checking of new roads constructed under the project. In 3 out of the 19 centres studied there seems to be no field checking at all.

Agency for and type of checking

It is further interesting to examine who does the checking and what is the kind of checking-on-the-spot or desk scrutiny—that is

done, and how often it is done. The table below gives details of checking of performance figures relating to project activity.

Sl. No.	Progress indicators	No. of blocks reporting project part	No. of blocks checked	No. of blocks checked by			
				B.D.O. (Total)	B.D.O. on the spot in the field	Extension Officer (Total)	Extension Officer on the spot in the field
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Chemical fertilizers distributed.	16	12	3	2	10	5
2	Improved seeds distributed.	18	16	5	4	13	5
3	Area under Japanese method of cultivation.	15	12	3	2	12	9
4	Agricultural demonstrations held.	19	17	6	6	15	14
5	Net area under irrigation	7	3	2	1	3	1
6	Waste and virgin land reclaimed.	12	2	1	..	1	1
7	Drinking water wells constructed.	19	18	9	9	14	13
8	Community centres started.	17	15	6	5	11	11
9	New roads constructed	19	13	8	7	11	11
10	Existing roads improved	15	8	6	5	6	6

Cols. 5 and 7 read with Col. 4 show that in some instances, a block is checked by more than one officer. B. D. O. seems to concentrate more on the constructional item while the Extension Officer is more active in the case of agricultural items. In general, the B.D.O. does the checking on the spot; in particular for drinking water wells and agricultural demonstrations where all the B.D.Os who did the checking did so on the spot. The Extension Officer seems to rely largely on desk checking for the two items, improved seeds, and chemical fertilizers. Quantitative information is not available on the number of centres where desk scrutiny is done at the block headquarter only and not at the Gram Sevaks headquarter. But, our reports suggest that very often scrutiny does not extend to the latter.

Periodicity of Checking

Periodicity of checking is a good indication of the seriousness that is attached to the operation. The following table gives in cols.

4 and 6 the number of centres where the on-the-spot regular checking by the B.D.O. and the Extension Officer could not be firmly established according to this indicator :—

Sl. No.	Progress indicators	Checked by B.D.O.		Checked by Extension Officer	
		No. of centres where checked	No. of centres without specified periodicity	No. of centres where checked	No. of centres without specified periodicity
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Chemical fertilizers distributed . .	2	1	5	2
2	Improved seeds distributed . . .	4	2	5	4
3	Area under Japanese method of cultivation	2	1	9	4
4	Agricultural demonstrations held . .	6	4	14	6
5	Drinking water wells constructed . .	9	5	13	11
6	Community centres started . . .	5	2	11	4
7	New roads constructed	7	4	11	8

It seems that while the B.D.Os are reported to have done more on-the-spot checking of drinking water wells and agricultural demonstrations, a proportionately larger number of centres say that the periodicity of checking cannot be specified. For chemical fertilizers, and improved seeds, whatever little on-the-spot checking is done by Extension Officers, it is generally not done with any specific periodicity. The general conclusion would seem to be that, by and large, checking is not done seriously, and enough importance is not attached to it as a technique for maintaining and improving the quality of the data.

Checking of Departmental part

The departmental performance is generally checked by the departmental staff, in particular for chemical fertilizers and area under irrigation. The checking is done mostly on the spont. Only in a few cases, *e.g.*, agricultural demonstrations and improved seeds checking is done by the project staff. But here checking is merely desk scrutiny.

Time spent on records

Information was also collected on time spent during a month by the B.D.O. and the Extension Specialist on field checking or compiling various types of statements. The following table summarises the data:—

Sl. No.	Type of specialist	No. of centres which reported checking done: Never	Casually	1—3 days	4—7 days	8—12 days	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	B.D.O. . . .	2	6	3	6	2	
2	Extension Specialists (Agri.).	6	1	2	4	5	No Extension Specialist (Agri.) in one centre.
3	Extension Specialist (Cooperation).	6	1	3	4	3	No Extension Specialist (Coop.) in 2 centres.
4	Extension Specialists (Works).	6	2	3	3	2	No Extension Specialist in 2 centres and in 1 centre he could not be contacted.

The common notion that these block level officers are spending too much time on checking records to the neglect of their other work does not seem to be borne out by our data. And whatever checking on the spot is done by them is more often at places which they visit in connection with their normal work.

State directives in respect of checking

It is obvious from the previous analysis that checking of the primary data maintained by the Gram Sevak is far from adequate. In the hunt for reasons for this state of affairs we tried to ascertain whether the officers concerned had received directives from their State Governments; the need for such directives needs no emphasis. The majority of the B. D. Os. were unaware of any such directives. Three B.D.Os were not even certain whether any directives had been issued by their State Governments. It is a reflection on their awareness of the importance of field checking.

In Pusa (Bihar), a circular of the Development Commissioner desires the B.D.Os. to carry out detailed inspection of the Gram Sevak's office once every six months and field inspection and inspection of records of at least 2 Gram Sevaks every month. This includes detailed checking, on the spot, of the records maintained by the Gram Sevaks as well as looking into their actual achievements. In Bhathat (U.P.) the directives lay down that all the figures reported or recorded by the Gram Sevaks should be verified and checked on

the spot by the Extension Specialist and the B. D. O. In the case of seeds and fertilizers distributed by the cooperative seed stores, the Assistant Development Officer (Cooperatives) of the block is authorised to checking the figures. In Chalakudy (Kerala) since the beginning of 1958, three Extension Officers, two Social Education Organizers and one Agricultural Officer have been required to check field records and then report to B. D. O. and B. D. O. himself is expected to do field checking once in 3 months. In Manavadar (Bombay), the B.D.O. has instruction to check all the progress reports received from Gram Sevaks and the village level records maintained by them. The B.D.O. is also expected to report fortnightly on the nature and extent of the checking done by him and also give his observations in his tour diaries. However, no prescribed limit has been set as to the amount of checking that has to be done by him during a fortnight.

Role of Progress Assistant

The Ministry of Community Development has been very keen to imporve the quality of the primary records and the system of their maintenance and with that idea recommended the appointment of Progress Assistants at the block level. Unfortunately, as yet very few blocks have on their staff properly trained Progress Assistants. 11 out of the 19 blocks studied, still do not have them ; in one the Assistant left for a better job and the post had not been filled by the date of our enquiry. In another 4 blocks new recruits who lack adequate training have been appointed. Even in the centres where Progress Assistants exist, they are not always assigned the job for which they were intended. This is shown by the reports from two centres where the Progress Assistants have been put on purely clerical work—compilation of records, maintenance of files etc. They never visited the field to examine the figures maintained by Gram Sevaks.

The role of the Progress Assistants has been correctly envisaged in the scheme, but is not properly played in many centres. Wherever this is done, the results are encouraging *e.g.* in two centres, Kolhapur (Bombay) and Pusa (Bihar), field visits, verification of figures, imparting of instructions to Gram Sevaks on the method of collecting data, and on the concept and standards involved, have been laid down as integral part of the duty of the Progress Assistant. Reports received from these centres suggest that there is some improvement in the block data because of the effort put forth by the Progress Assistants. It should, however, be kept in mind that the bias in the primary figures can creep in at two levels—(i) that of the Gram Sevak who is interested in showing off his achievement, and (ii) that of the Extension Specialist who has also a stake in the achievement figures. It is generally accepted that the figures relating to activities with which B.D.Os are associated like those concerned with loans, works, etc. are comparatively reliable, while those for area items and items like compost pits, youth clubs, smokeless *chulhas*, etc. with which Gram Sevaks are associated more directly, are less dependable. There is, however, less awareness to the danger of these figures being inflated at the instance of the Extension Officer. From the reports received from some centres, there is reason to believe that this bias is not negligible. Elimination of such bias is necessary and will become possible in the measure that the Progress Assistant works as an independent functionary at the block level under the administrative control of the B. D. O. but technical control

of the District Statistical Officer. The extent to which he does so depends, in part, on his pay and status. Reports from certain blocks seem to suggest that the low scale of pay of the Progress Assistants is responsible for the rather ineffective checking of the data passed on by the Extension Officers. It seems desirable to make their pay comparable with that of the Extension Specialists.

To summarize, not only should the concepts and standards relating to some progress indicators be carefully defined and uniformly enforced in the field, the coverage in respect of reporting should also conform to the instructions of the C. D. Ministry ; in particular the departmental performance should not be omitted. Moreover, the data should be maintained at the village level, and not simply, as at present, in many instances at the level of the block or the Gram Sevak circle. With the emphasis on the village as the unit for planning and the household as the ultimate beneficiary, it is only proper that both the performance and the target figures are maintained at the village level and the two sets of data are co-terminous in their coverage. Checking on the spot is at present extremely inadequate ; most checking is of the desk scrutiny type. Moreover, wherever on-the-spot checks are made, they are done in a perfunctory way, the primary objective being to see that records are maintained rather than verify the correctness of the figures recorded. More time should be devoted to field checking. There should be clear directives from the State Governments giving in detail the role of the B.D.O., the Extension Specialist and the Progress Assistant in this regard. The danger of inflation of these figures by the Gram Sevak is known but that the inflation may take place at the instance of Extension Specialist should also be recognised. And to reduce this danger, the Progress Assistant should function independently under the administrative control of the B.D.O. but technical control of District Statistical Officer. Moreover, his pay should be made comparable with that of the Extension Specialists. Further it should be his primary duty to visit the field frequently and regularly, verify the figures that go into the records, impart instructions to the Gram Sevaks on the method of getting the primary data, on the concepts and standards etc. He should not be burdened with clerical work at the block headquarter at the cost of his basic responsibility.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

CURRENT EVALUATION

1. *The personnel and finances of a block should be proportionate to its size.*—Our study shows that the average block is 25% larger than the programme's norm in terms of population, and that large blocks do not have proportionately larger personnel and finance. This has led to dilution of the programme in these blocks. There are cogent reasons for making the blocks fit into the existing administrative units. This may, however, lead to the creation of blocks larger than the programme has prescribed. The block personnel and finance should be proportionately increased in such cases.

2. *The Blocks should be increased in number only as the supply of personnel increases.*—Our study shows that shortage of block personnel continues to be serious. For example, 40% of them had no B.D.Os to look after them for varying lengths of time and 60% of the N.E.S. and C.D. blocks had no agricultural specialist for nearly a fourth of the periods during which the programme had been in operation in them.

3. *The programme and the staffing pattern of the Blocks should be in accordance with the special needs of the areas where they are located.*—There has been something like an attempt to make blocks with serious reference to their special needs and circumstances. In fact respect of staff and programme.

The staffing of different blocks does not seem to have been done with serious reference to their special needs and circumstances. In fact the block programmes themselves do not seem to have been evolved in terms of their needs and circumstances. The result is that the effective service that the blocks receive is less than what the size of their staff would suggest. Moreover, in many instances, the programme does not touch some of the basic problems of the block and its impact on the block's economy and people is small. In particular the programme and the staff have not been adjusted to the requirements of the less developed, dry areas which cover the bulk of the country. The programme has been also ineffective in tribal and hilly areas. On the other hand, some of the relatively developed areas which can profitably use more specialised assistance do not get it.

4. *The status of the Block Development Officer and his qualifications should be higher than they are at present.*—With the move towards democratic decentralisation, the pooling together of block and departmental resources in men and money, the emphasis on area development and increase in the block staff and the number of the Gram Sevaks, the responsibilities of the B.D.O. would increase and he would occupy a key position in the whole scheme of development. These changes call for persons of higher calibre and higher status.*

*Action in this direction is already being taken by the Ministry of Community Development, Govt. of India.

5. *Stress should be given to the development of extension work in all fields besides agriculture, and specialists relieved as much as possible of administrative work.*—There is little extension work outside agriculture. But it is extension work which brings the Block specialist into contact with the B.D.O. and gives him the opportunity to participate in the planning for development of the block. This, of course, implies, as a prior condition, that there must be in these fields more specialists than are required for the running of the basic service units. Where, for example, the health experts are not enough in number to run the rural dispensaries, they cannot evidently take up extension work.

According to our findings, most of the problems with which the block level specialist is worried are administrative. Among the problems referred to by him to the district level specialist, the administrative and financial questions predominate.

6. *The contact between the Block specialist and the Gram Sevak should be developed. The role and the jurisdiction of the latter should be more clearly thought out.*—At present the contacts between the Block level specialist and the Gram Sevak in fields other than agriculture are few and far between; most of these specialists are engaged in routine work in their fields while the Gram Sevak is pre-eminently an extension worker. Moreover, the Block level specialists feel that they can do without the Gram Sevak. He is according to them either not available or not qualified enough in their fields to act as a channel for the transmission of technical assistance to the villager. This situation hardly fits in with the concept of the role of the Gram Sevak as the multi-purpose extension worker. The latter should either be qualified in more fields than he is at present, but have a smaller area to look after, or alternatively he should be more qualified in a few fields and share with other village level specialists, the task of serving a bigger charge. More thinking should be devoted to this basic issue. The basic role of the Gram Sevak is that of the general purpose extension worker, which is buttressed by his specialised knowledge of the most important field, *viz.*, agriculture. It is difficult to think of him as a multi-purpose specialist, and as the rural economy develops, the need for specialised services will grow and the number of specialised functionaries at the village level have to be increased.

As it is, the Gram Sevak's charge is, on the average, 25% larger than the norm laid down by the programme, which, according to our enquiry, approximates to what the Gram Sevaks generally speaking, consider to be the optimum charge. However, the Gram Sevak's activities do not, at present, extend to all fields, and the service they render to villages which are not their headquarters is extremely limited. 45% of these villages do not receive a visit by him even once a month.

7. *The procedure involved in making funds available to the block requires simplification.*—Block development has suffered from under-budgetting and under-spending of the budgetted amounts. The main reason for the latter has been procedural ; funds have not been sanctioned and sanctioned amounts not made available to the blocks soon enough. Steps were taken during the first two years of the community projects to decentralise powers in this respect. But there seems to be still considerable room for improvement. Also, there has not been enough of planning ahead. On the other hand, according to our enquiry

most B.D.Os. feel that their block budgets are insufficient and they could usefully spend more money on the development of their charges.

8. *The issues involved in people's participation in the programme requires thorough study by all concerned.*—This issue has been discussed to some extent elsewhere. The Current Evaluation study shows that the people's participation measured *per capita* and in terms of money value, was higher in the C.D. than the N.E.S. Blocks. But in both categories of blocks, the value of this contribution tended to decline as the block period drew to its close.

9. *For the under-privileged sections of the rural society to secure more benefit out of the programme, the latter must be reoriented considerably, in favour of non-agricultural or rather non-land holding classes.*—According to our enquiry, the Harijans and the backward classes have benefited along with others from the construction of village roads, the digging of drinking water wells and the setting up of village schools. The drinking water wells and still more the schools have been open to them in the large majority of instances, while they have shared with others the convenience of better village roads. The instances in which they have been forced to give their labour or give more of it than others are few. But the programme's activity is, by and large, concentrated on cultivation, and in as much as Harijans and the backward classes are either landless labourers or rely upon other occupations, they have not participated in the benefits of the programme.

Acceptance of Practices

Improved Seeds.

1. *Greater extension effort is required, especially for non-cash crops, and among the smaller cultivators. The extension service should also be reoriented with emphasis on convincing the doubting farmer of the real superiority of the improved varieties and on better arrangement for supply rather than on the provision of finance.*—Our enquiry shows that quite a proportion of the cultivating households seem to have no knowledge of improved seeds; that cultivators have taken to the use of improved seeds much more in the case of cotton and sugar-cane than of wheat, paddy, potato and jowar; and that among these adopting cultivators those with the larger holdings predominate. Appreciable percentages of the farmers who are dissatisfied with improved seeds or have given them up seem to be unconvinced of their alleged superiority. Very few of them complain about lack of finance, but an increasing number have experienced difficulty in securing the supply.

Fertilizers.

2. *The extension service for fertilizers has to develop even more than for improved seeds, both quantitatively and qualitatively and more for, fertilizers other than ammonium sulphate. It has to be linked with the extension work for improved seeds and adequate provision for the supply of finance to the farmer has to be made. More attention has to be given to the long term suitability of the fertilizers to the soils of the areas where they are recommended as also to their*

prices relatively to their yields on the average farm.—Our data show that a much smaller percentage of the cultivating households have taken to the use of fertilizers than of improved seeds. Extension effort in this field, speaking generally, might have been, in some measure, inhibited by the difficulty of supply, actual or anticipated. But the argument would not apply to green manures; a fourth of the households which had not taken to them had "no knowledge" about them. Secondly, the use of fertilizers spread more slowly than that of improved seeds between the two enquiries. Lack of finance is given as the most important reason by the reverting households. Quite a good percentage of such holdings were not convinced of their value and another but smaller fraction had found ammonium sulphate and manure mixtures detrimental to the soil.

Improved methods.

3. *Improved methods should be propagated more extensively especially in the case of the Japanese method, but also more carefully and where possible, in combination with improved seeds and fertilizers. The cultivators should be instructed on the full implication of the Japanese method and all the processes involved should be undertaken. Efforts to spread crop rotation and transplantation should be accompanied by increased irrigation facilities. The labour difficulty that both Japanese method and line sowing have raised should be looked into.*—Our investigation reveals that only 15% of relevant households have taken to the Japanese method of paddy cultivation and that the households which have not taken to it mostly plead ignorance. Households which have not tried crop rotation and transplantation complain mostly of lack of irrigation facilities, while those which have not adopted transplantation and Japanese method give shortage of labour as the most important reason. The farmers who have tried the Japanese method but have given it up were not impressed by the results achieved. They feel it involved more labour for which they did not get adequate return. Our Records enquiry, however, shows that the method is applied in a slip-shod manner in many areas. Households which have adopted improved seeds, fertilizers and improved methods are much smaller in number than those which have taken to anyone of these three ways of increasing output. This is probably in part the result of extension services being operated without reference to the individual farm as the unit for development.

People's participation: (a) Co-operatives

4. *Every possible attempt should be made to bring in the poorer sections of the rural population within the fold of the co-operative movement. The policy of linking loans to credit-worthy purposes rather than to credit-worthy persons should be put into practice more effectively.*—Our enquiry shows that the benefits of the co-operative credit societies go mostly to the larger cultivators in the villages, who also play the dominant part in the panchayats.

(b) *Voluntary Institutions*

5. *The whole approach, content and technique of the programme in the field of social activity should be examined thoroughly.*—Our enquiry shows that only a small percentage of the villages as yet

possess the social institutions like community centres which have been recommended and that most of these institutions are inactive or moribund. While rural households have participated in large numbers in the construction of village roads, school houses, and drinking water wells, they show little interest in the organisations which are intended for recreation and social intercourse. Probably the programme has no yet struck upon the right type of institutions or the proper technique of social education.

The Panchayat

1. *The practice of the Panchayat President selecting his co-members should not be encouraged.*—Contested elections have brought out group rivalries and probably even aggravated them. But a unanimous panchayat does not necessarily reflect solidarity in the village. On the other hand, it tends further to reduce the interest of the village community in the institution.

2. *The experiment with the Panchayat having to report its achievements periodically to the Gram Sabha and secure approval of its budget needs to be watched longer.*—Our study does not show that the meetings of the Gram Sabhas for this purpose have been successful. They have failed to evoke popular enthusiasm and have, generally speaking, proved ineffective.

3. *Additional responsibility, especially for development works, should not be imposed on the panchayats, at least, for some time to come. The functions of the panchayats and co-operative societies should be clearly distinguished from one another.*—Our study shows that panchayats in many areas do not discharge even their elementary civic responsibilities adequately. The load placed on their shoulders should be increased only as they gain in experience and strength. The first concern should be to improve their efficiency as municipal bodies. Ways may, however, be thought out of bringing the panchayats into closer association with developmental work in the villages. Arrangement for supply of seed, development of cottage industries etc. are jobs for the co-operative societies and not the panchayats.

4. *Provision should be made for the systematic education of the members of the Panchayat on their duties and responsibilities.*—Our study shows that the standard of literacy among the members of the panchayats is very low. As a result, the running of the institution is left largely to the President or the Secretary. The first step in democracy should be to educate, at least, the representatives of the people, in their powers and responsibilities.

5. *The Panchayat Secretary should be a trained person and well paid. He should be under the control of the Panchayat and paid by it even if his salary is contributed by a higher body.*—The panchayat secretaries who are full time servants of the government and paid by

it have been found to be of a higher calibre, generally speaking, than others directly engaged by the panchayats themselves. But where the panchayat members including the president are only half literate, the Secretary tends to run the institution for them rather than operate as its servant. Our long-run interest is in the effective functioning of the panchayat as a democratic institution rather than in its efficient operation as a bureaucracy.

6. *Official control of Panchayats should be reduced as much as possible.*—Panchayats in many States cannot, on their own, incur expenditure except of a minor character. Their power in other directions is also circumscribed. Our study shows that this has dampened the enthusiasm and thwarted the initiative of the panchayat members and given to the villagers the impression that the panchayat is merely an instrument of the higher government. Democracy with too many safeguards tends to degenerate into bureaucracy.

7. *On the other hand, the inspection of the panchayats should be improved. The role of the Panchayat inspector should be not merely inspection but guidance too.*—At present the Panchayat inspection officer has charge over a wide area and the inspection of the village panchayats he carries out, tends to be mechanical and few and far between. The situation would improve with the Panchayat inspector becoming a part of the Block Staff, but the role of the inspector has to be widened into that of the friend, philosopher and guide of the panchayat. This weak institution at the base requires fostering as much as checking.

8. *As regards the resources of the Panchayats, the stress should be on measures designed to promote fuller exploitation of the sources of income at their disposal rather than on an expansion of the list of taxes they are, by law, required or permitted to impose. Systematic experiment should be tried with specific purpose grants from the government matched by contributions raised by the panchayats from the village people.*—Most panchayats have very low incomes, but in no instance does the actual income come near the potential. In general, the panchayats rely upon a very few taxes, but the actual collection is much poorer than the total dues. One way out of this situation may be found in the Bhoodan idea; the villagers may agree to part with some of their land to the panchayat once for all rather than pay taxes to it year in and year out. Panchayats which possess some property in land seem to be better off, other things being equal, than those which do not have it. A second solution is suggested by the experience of people's participation in projects of common benefit—roads, school houses and drinking water wells. The villagers have responded to the incentive which the matching grants from the Community Projects have offered by coming out with contributions in cash, labour and, sometimes, in land. Attempts should be made to exploit this technique more systematically, with the Panchayat as the channel or medium, for the collection and use of the funds raised. Both the solutions are in consonance with our tradition; our people seem to respond to the appeal for gifts more readily than to the demand for regular payment of taxes.

BLOCK RECORDS

I. Daily Diaries.

The daily diary and similar records which relate to the Gram Sevak's own activity should be uniform in pattern and content, and submitted regularly to the B.D.O.—At present, they differ widely from block to block and in some blocks the Gram Sevaks do not even submit these records to the B.D.Os.

II. Progress Records: (a) *Concepts & Standards.*

The concepts and standards relevant to the progress indicators should be carefully defined and uniformly enforced.—This is not done at present. The "improved seed" for example, may mean any one or more of the following; nucleus seed; seeds obtained from registered growers, progressive farmers, private nurseries, and natural spread. The term "Japanese method" has been applied in one instance to paddy cultivation in which the only new technique is dibbling, while "compost pits" mean in some cases just cow dung piled up on level ground.

(b) *Maintenance and submission.*

Progress reports prepared by the Gram Sevaks should be uniform in content and maintained at his headquarter village.—At present they are even less uniform than the daily diaries. Sometimes the Gram Sevak reports on his own activity alone; in other instances his report covers all activities in his circle. In some blocks he does not maintain it at his headquarter village; the B.D.O. gets him to fill up the village improvement sheets at the fortnightly meeting and the sheets are filed at the B. D. O.'s Office.

The Gram Sevak on transfer should hand over the records to his successor before leaving his circle.—This is not done at present in some instances, and the consequent loss of old records considerably reduces the value of progress statistics.

(c) *Coverage.*

The progress reports should in respect of their coverage, conform to the instructions of the Community Development Ministry; they should include both block and departmental activities. Both the target figures and the performance data should be shown village-wise as well as in relation to the Gram Sevak's circle.—Departmental performance is now often omitted from these reports, and with the emphasis on village planning, circlewise data are not enough.

(d) *Checking.*

Progress reports should be checked on the spot, with a view to verify their correctness, and there should be clear directions to the B.D.O., the extension specialists and the Progress Assistant, on their respective roles. The Progress Assistant should regularly check the data in the field and advice the Gram Sevak on the collection and recording of data.—At present most checking is done at the desk rather than in the field, and where the checking is done in the field, it is carried out in a perfunctory manner. Some Progress Assistants have been found saddled with clerical work at the Block headquarters; they do not pay enough visits to the field and check for themselves the progress reports prepared by the Gram Sevaks.

TABLES

11—2 Plan. Com. 58

Tables on Chapter II— Current Evaluation Study

Table No	Heading
1.	General information about selected blocks.
2.	Particulars of B. D.O's.
3.	Block level specialists—Agriculture.
4.	Particulars of Gram Sevaks (Male).
5.	Area of operation of Gram Sevaks—Actual and optimum.
6.	Finance.
7.	Important achievements of the Block as reported by B. D. O.
8.	Achievements of Block in the field of Agriculture.
9.	Non-project inputs & Gram Sevaks' effort contributing to agricultural production reported by B. D. O's and D. A. O's.
10.	Seed & fertilizer programme.
11.	Supply position of improved seeds & chemical fertilizers.
12.	No. of B. D. O's reporting some important failures in different fields.
13.	Co-operative institutions.
14.	Panchayats—Data for selected villages.
15.	Programmes for under privileged classes in selected villages.
16.	Co-operation with departments.
17.	Pattern of specialists visits to villages and Gram Sevak circles.
18.	No. of specialists reporting performance in their field independent of Gram Sevak and reasons for the same.
19.	Suggestions by specialists to improve performance of Gram Sevak.
20.	Assistance by specialists to Gram Sevaks, as reported by Gram Sevaks.
21.	Frequency of visits of Gram Sevaks to non-headquarter villages and their night halts away from headquarters.
22.	Village level functionaries undertaking different activities as reported by Gram Sevaks
23.	Membership of B.A.C.

TABLE 1—*General information about selected blocks*

Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1		2	3	4
No. of block returns received		36	46	82
No. of villages in a Block . .	Average . . .	129	124	126
	Maximum . .	401	441	441
	Minimum . .	21	10	10
Total population in a Block (000's of persons)	Average . . .	77·3	72·2	75·0
	Maximum . .	183·8	159·8	183·8
	Minimum . .	16·6	12·9	12·9
Per Block	Duration of (years and months) present phase.	1-6	1-9	1-8
	Duration of N.E.S. pattern before conversion to C.D.	2-1	..	2-1
Total Geographical area of a Block (in sq. miles).	Average . . .	274·2	316·0	297·6
	Maximum . .	585·3	1,654·0	1,654·0
	Minimum . .	75·0	36·9	36·9
Total net cultivated area of a Block (000's of acres).	Average . .	86·9	71·4	78·2
	Maximum . .	264·5	191·8	264·5
	Minimum . .	23·4	3·5	3·5
Total Irrigated area of a Block (000's of acres).	Avearage . .	17·3	9·5	12·9
	Maximum . .	52·6	68·4	68·4
	Minimum . .	0·3	0·3	0·3
Percentage of net cultivated area to total geographical area (All blocks.)		38·6	41·8	40·2
Percentage of net irrigated area to total net cultivated area (All blocks)		19·9	13·2	16·5

TABLE 2—*Particulars of B.D.O.'s*

Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1		2	3	4
No. of B.D.O. returns received		35	46	81
No. with previous background of .	Revenue . .	14	18	32
	Agriculture . .	3	11	14
	Other Govt. Department	16	15	31
	Social or Political work.	..	..	..
No. having parent department		30	39	69

1		2	3	4
Order in the present Block	Since inauguration	2·4	1·6	2·1
	In present phase	1·6	..	1·6
Average period of shortage per reporting block (in Yrs.-Months.)	Since first inauguration. No. of blocks reporting	16	15	31
	Duration (in months.)	5	4	5
No. with educational qualifications	Under graduate	4	5	9
	Graduate	15	12	27
	Post-graduate	11	15	26
	Technical	5	14	19
Average length of service per B.D.O. (Yrs.-Months)	Total	13-3	11-2	12-0
	In C. P. Work	2-4	2-5	2-4
No. satisfying minimum qualifications		34	43	77
No. having minimum prescribed training		29	34	63
No. considering present appointment as:—	Promotion	15	17	32
	Demotion	..	1	1
	Demotion with bad effects.	2	3	5
	Neither promotion nor demotion.	13	18	31
No. satisfied with conditions of service.		23	30	53
No. dissatisfied with conditions of service		9	14	23
No. who like to go back to parent department		6	12	18

TABLE 3—*Block Level Specialists—Agriculture*

Sl. No.	Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1	2		3	4	5
1	No. of blocks returns received		36	46	82
2	No. of posts sanctioned.		34	42	76
3	No. of specialists posted		33	40	73
4	Average order in present block.	Since inauguration	2·3	1·5	1·8
		In present phase	1·5	..	1·5
5	Total service (Years and months).	In this line	7-1	5-3	6-1
		In C.D. work	2-8	2-1	2-4
		In this block	1-9	1-3	1-6
		No reply	3	5	8
6	No. satisfying minimum qualifications.	Yes	32	38	70
		No	1	2	3
7	No. having received prescribed minimum training.	Yes	25	27	52
		No	7	7	14
		No training prescribed	..	6	6

1	2		3	4	5
8	Scope for creative work	No. reporting	30	35	65
		Yes	29	33	62
		No	1	2	3
9	Effect of block work on career.	Favourable	2	..	2
		Unfavourable	6	4	10
		Neither or 'does not arise.'	19	23	42
	Opinion of B.D.O.'s				
	According to B.D.O.'s the specialist has :				
	(i) Adequate training	Yes	29	34	63
		No	3	4	7
		No reply	..	1	1
	(ii) Extension aptitude	Yes	27	28	55
		No	5	10	15
		No reply	..	1	1

TABLE 4—*Particulars of Gram Sevaks (Male)*

Sl. No.	Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1	2		3	4	5
1	No. of Block returns received		36	46	82
2	Average No. per Block	Sanctioned	12	10.2	11.4
		Posted	10.7	9.6	10.10
3	Total No. of Gram Sevaks posted		386	442	828
4	No. of villages per Gram Sevak		11·8	12·6	12·3
5	Population per posted Gram Sevak (000')		7·3	7·3	7·3
6	Area (sq. miles) per Gram Sevak		25·6	28·9	27·4
7	Average period of service as a Gram Sevak (Yrs. & Months.)	Total	2-10	1-9	2-2
		In this Block	2-5	1-4	1-9
8	No. with educational qualifications.	Below Matric	111	112	223*
		Matric	226	273	499
		Undergraduate	26	42	68
		Graduate	21	14	35
9	No. having received basic agricultural training		240	335	575
10	No. having received extension training		369	420	789
11	BDO's opinion	No. having adequate technical training.	283	356	639
		No. having adequate extension aptitude.	311	351	662
		No. said to be too young for the job.	8	10	18

* Data not available for 3 Gram Sevaks.

TABLE 5—*Area of operation of Gram Sevaks— Actual and optimum*

Sl. No.	Particulars	No.
1	2	3
1	No. of block returns received	82
2	No. of Gram Sevak returns received	397
3	Population covered by Gram Sevaks:	(in 000's)
	(*i*) Based on all Gram Sevaks :	
	Mean Average	7.3
	Mean Maximum in any block	14.1
	Mean Minimum in any block	2.4
	(*ii*) Based on selected Gram Sevaks :	
	Mean average	7.6
	Mean Maximum in any block	21.8
	Mean Minimum in any block	2.7
	(*iii*) Optimum as suggested by selected Gram Sevaks :	
	Mean Average	6.6
	Mean Maximum in any block	10.0
	Mean Minimum in any block	1.0
4	No. of villages per Gram Sevak :	
	(*i*) Based on all Gram Sevak :	
	Mean Average	12.3
	Mean Maximum in any block	49.0
	Mean Minimum in any block	2.8
	(*ii*) Optimum as suggested by selected Gram Sevaks :	
	Mean average	7.5
	Mean Maximum in any block	18.0
	Mean Minimum in any block	3.0
5	Area of operation as based on all Gram Sevaks (sq. miles) :	
	Mean average	27.4
	Mean Maximum in any block	133.3
	Mean Minimum in any block	4.7
6	No. of Gram Sevaks who say that their area of operation is too large:	
	Yes	268
	No	127
	No reply	2

TABLE 6—*Finance*

Sl. No.	Particulars	N.E.S.	C.D.
1	2	3	4
1	No. of block returns received	46	36
2	Amount budgeted for block period per block (Rs. 000'). . .	463·3 (44)	12,73·3 (34)
3	Amount spent from the beginning of the block till the end of September 1957 per block (Rs. 000').	172·0 (46)	572·8 (34)
4	Percentage of total expenditure to amount budgeted . .	38·2 (44)	45·0 (34)
5	Percentage of amount spent in earlier phase to total expenditure.	Not relevant.	47·9 (33)
	Percentage of administrative expenditure to total . . .	39·6 (46)	23·2 (33)
7	People's contribution per block (since project inception) (Rs. 000'). .	129·2 (44)	541·0 (34)
8	Percentage of people's contribution to total expenditure .	75·6 (44)	85·5 (32)

Figures within ( ) in Columns 3 and 4 denote the No. of relevant blocks.

TABLE 7—*Important achievements of the Block as reported by B. D. O.*

Sl. No.	Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1	2		3	4	5
1	No. of B.D.O's returns received . . .		33	43	76
2	Introduction and/or distribution of improved seeds.	A	6	7	13
		B	19	19	38
3	Chemical fertilizers	A	4	3	7
		B	16	27	43
4	Pesticides	A	1	..	1
		B	2	5	7
5	Irrigation works	A	1	3	4
		B	11	10	21
6	Japanese method of paddy cultivation . .	A	3	2	5
		B	7	8	15
7	Fruit plantation	A	1	..	1
		B	5	5	10
8	Control of diseases among cattle . . .	A	..	1	1
		B	8	5	13
9	Artificial insemination	A	..	..	..
		B	4	2	6

1	2		3	4	5
10	Maternity centres	A	..	..	..
		B	2	..	2
11	Construction of drinking water wells	A	2	4	6
		B	20	20	40
12	Roads & culverts constructions	A	6	5	11
		B	24	23	47
13	Construction of School Building	A	3	1	4
		B	18	12	30
14	Payment of streets & construction of drains	A	1	..	1
		B	3	6	9
15	Construction of social education centre	A	..	..	..
		B	2	4	6
16	Youth Club	A	..	..	..
		B	5	4	9
17	Womens' Club	A	..	1	1
		B	4	5	9
18	Adult literacy centre	A	..	..	..
		B	3	13	16
19	Community centres	A	..	..	..
		B	11	10	21
20	Establishment of cooperative societies	A	..	4	4
		B	16	19	35
21	Panchayats	A	..	..	..
		B	4	1	5

NOTE : 'A' First.
'B' Any

TABLE 8—*Achievements of block in the field of Agriculture*

Sl. No.	Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1	2		3	4	5
1	No. of B.D.O's returns received		35*	46	81
2	*No. of B.D.O.S. reporting achievements*				
	(i) Seeds	A	13	16	29
		B	25	27	52
	(ii) Chemical fertilizer	A	8	8	16
		B	29	27	56
	(iii) Pesticides	A	1	..	1
		B	5	4	9

1	2		3	4	5
	(iv) Minor irrigation work	A B	2 5	6 11	8 16
	(v) Japanese method of cultivation .	A B	7 11	6 10	13 21
	(vi) Land Reclamation	A B	.. ..	1 2	1 2
	(vii) Soil conservation	A B	.. 1	.. ..	.. 1
	(viii) Consolidation of holding . . .	A B	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..

A=The item as first out of three achievements in agriculture.
B=The item in any place in the three achievements in agriculture.
*=Data for one Block not available.

TABLE 9—*Non-project inputs and Gram Sevaks' effort contributing to agricultural production as reported by B. D. Os. and D. A. Os.*

Sl. No.	Particulars	No. of B. D. O's reporting			No. of D. A. O's reporting		
		C.D.	N.E.S.	Total	C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	No. of officers reporting .	35	46	81	31	40	71
2	The main non-project inputs are :						
	(i) Seed . . .	28	23	51	22	24	46
	(ii) Fertilizers . .	25	22	47	22	20	42
	(iii) Pesticides . .	15	6	21	11	6	17
	(iv) Minor irrigation .	14	12	26	9	9	13
	(v) Large irrigation .	4	5	9	3	2	5
	(vi) Reclamation . .	3	2	5	..	1	1
	(vii) Soil conservation .	1	1	2	1	1	2
	(viii) Any . . .	35	39	74	27	31	58
3	Gram Sevaks are paying more attention to Agricultural production programme :						
	Yes . . .	31	39	70	14	17	31
	No . . .	4	3	7	14	20	34
4	Gram Sevaks should put in greater effort for agricultural production programme:						
	Yes . . .	31	30	61	26	30	56
	No . . .	3	5	8	1	2	3

TABLE 10—*Seed & fertilizer programme*

Sl. No.	Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1	2		3	4	
1	No. of block returns received		36	46	82
2	No. of blocks reporting establishment of seed farms		13	11	24
3	No. of blocks reporting seed multiplication schemes		28	27	55
4	Distribution outlets on the date of visit:				
	(i) No. of blocks reporting		36	44	80
	(ii) No. distributing seed, fertilizer & other agricultural supplies		128	232	360
	(iii) No. distributing seed fertilizer only		249	122	371
	(iv) No. distributing seed only		134	75	209
5	Increase in distribution outlets:				
	(i) No. of B.D.O's. reporting	Adequate	14	18	32
		Inadequate	13	12	25
		No increase	4	13	17
	(ii) No. of D.A.Os. reporting	Adequate	8	17	25
		Inadequate	19	13	32
		No increase	1	9	10
6	Cooperative agencies associated with distribution		24	27	51
7	No. of blocks where selected new seeds introduced.	Any	21	23	44
		Wheat	7	4	11
		Paddy	2	4	6
		Cotton	4	2	6
		Sugarcane	4	4	8
		Others	19	17	36
8	No. of blocks where use of improved seeds has increased.	Any	32	39	71
		Wheat	18	23	41
		Paddy	21	24	45
		Cotton	7	7	14
		Sugarcane	8	8	16
		Others	24	28	52
9	No. of Blocks where selected new fertilizer/manure introduced successfully.	Any	25	32	57
		Ammonium sulphate	10	7	17
		Super phosphate	13	19	32
		Fertilizer Mixture.	2	1	3
		Others	22	25	47
10	Improved fertilizer/manure increased	Any	32	39	71
		Ammonium sulphate	26	34	60
		Super phosphate	19	20	39
		Fertilizer mixture	2	7	9
		Others	25	22	47

TABLE 11—*Supply position of improved seeds & chemical fertilisers*

Particulars	Wheat			Paddy			Cotton			Ammonium Sulphate			Super Phosphate		
	CD	NES	Total	CD	NES	Total	CD	NES	Total	CD	NES	Total	CD	NES	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
No. of blocks where :															
(a) Supply is equal to or more than indented quantity.	4	15	19	6	12	18	10	4	14	10	15	25	8	11	19
(b) Supply is less than indented quantity.	7	8	15	6	14	20	1	4	5	5	7	12	6	5	11
Extent of shortage															
(i) Less than 25%	..	1	1	1	5	6	..	3	3	2	2	4	..	..	..
(ii) 25 to 50%	1	3	4	2	3	5	..	..	..	..	3	3	1	2	3
(iii) More than 50%	6	4	10	3	6	9	1	1	2	3	2	5	5	3	8
(c) Supplies not received in time.	1	3	4	..	2	2	1	..	1	3	10	13	3	11	14
(d) Supply not of good quality.	..	1	1	1	2	3	..	..	..	3	1	4	1	--	1
(e) Supply not received in time & not of good quality.	..	2	2	..	1	1	1	2	3	..	2	2	--	1	1

TABLE 12 —*No. of B. D. O.s reporting some important failures in different fields*

Sl. No.	Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1	2		3	4	5
1	No. of block returns received .		35	45	80
2	Failure in Agriculture .	Any	20	30	53
		Distribution of fertilisers.	2	12	14
		Japanese method of paddy cultivation	3	6	9
		Irrigation projects.	5	5	10
3	Failure in Animal Husbandry	Any	18	19	37
		Inadequate supply of pedigree cows.	3	1	4
		Inadequate supply of pedigree Bulls	3	2	5
		Artificial Insemination	4	2	6
		Castrations . .	2	3	5
		Control of disease and epidemics	1	5	6
4	Failure in cooperation . .	Any	20	214	41
		Cooperative Organisation.	4	12	16
		Lack of Peoples' cooperation.	4	9	13
5	Failure in Panchayat . .	Any	12	14	26
		Proper supervision & guidance.	1	6	7
		Smooth working	3	5	8
6	Failure in Public Health . .	Any . . .	20	16	36
		Sanitary latrines. .	10	8	18
		Drainage & sanitation.	5	5	10
7	Failure in Communication .	Any . . .	15	11	26
		Construction of roads .	9	8	17
		People's participation .	3	1	4
8	Failure in Social Education .	Any . . .	16	17	33
		Women welfare work .	4	6	10
		Community Recreation centre.	3	4	7
9	Failure in Cottage Industries .	Any . . .	7	3	10
		Weavers' Society .	2	..	2

TABLE 13 —*Cooperative Institutions*

Sl. No.	Particulars		CD	NES	Total
1	2		3	4	5
	No. of returns received		35	44	79
	Primary Credit Societies				
1	No. of blocks where primary credit societies exist	(a)	26	26	52
		(b)	29	25	54
2	No. of societies per block	(a)	36·8	33·3	35·0
		(b)	45·9	38·0	42·2
3	No. of villages covered per block	(a)	32·6	35·4	33·9
		(b)	62·9	61·1	62·1
4	No. of villages not covered per block	(a)	97·9	86·6	92·6
		(b)	71·2	67·9	69·6

1	2		3	4	5
5	Membership per society	(a)	46·3	44·6	45·5
		(b)	61·0	64·4	62·4
6	Share capital per society (Rs.)	(a)	1236·3	1075·0	1159·7
		(b)	1351·2	1271.5	1318·4
7	Loan advanced during last year per society (Rs.)		5021·4	3903·7	4540·5
8	Loan recovered during last year per society (Rs.)		3494·2	2609·4	3113·6
9	Loan overdue at the time of visit per society (Rs.)		2021·2	997·7	1558·8
	Multipurpose Societies				
1	No. of blocks where Multipurpose societies exist	(a)	22	25	47
		(b)	28	34	62
2	No. of societies per reporting block	(a)	17·3	23·2	20·4
		(b)	43·8	25·6	34·4
3	No. of villages covered per reporting block	(a)	40·7	28·6	34·2
		(b)	84·8	51·4	66·6
4	No. of villages not covered per block	(a)	98·7	86·0	91·8
		(b)	50·9	62·9	57·4
5	Membership per society	(a)	67·7	44·2	53·6
		(b)	74·8	51·7	64·2
6	Share capital per society (Rs.)	(a)	1357·3	1273·6	1307·1
		(b)	1188·5	1623·0	1407·6
7	Loans advanced during last year per society (Rs.)		1124·0	2861·8	1744·1
8	Loans recovered during last year per society (Rs.)		2018·1	2153·4	2088·2
9	Loans overdue at the time of visit per society (Rs.)		1854·8	575·7	1188·6
	Industrial Cooperatives				
1	No. of blocks where industrial cooperatives exist	(a)	13	18	31
		(b)	26	28	54
2	No. of societies per reporting block	(a)	7·1	6·9	7·0
		(b)	7·6	7·1	7·3
3	No. of villages covered per reporting block	(a)	16·3	10·9	13·6
		(b)	29·0	24·9	26·9
4	No. of villages not covered per block	(a)	112·4	109·6	111·0
		(b)	99·7	87·8	93·5
5	Membership per society	(a)	67·1	69·0	68·2
		(b)	61·3	60·6	61·0
6	Share capital per society (Rs.)	(a)	1268·4	1298·0	1283·9
		(b)	1386·3	881·1	1131·8
7	Value of production sold per society (Rs.)		13922·1	14337·1	14143·1

(a)=Pre-block position
(b)=Position on date of visit.

TABLE 14 — *Panchayats—Data for Selected Villages*

Sl. No.	Particulars	No.
1	2	3
1	No. of villages studied	404
2	No. of villages having panchayats	290
3	*No. of villages in which panchayat was organised :*	
	(a) before inception of block	201
	(b) after inception of block	85
4	Average membership per panchayat	11·7
5	*No. of panchayats reporting having received assistance from the block staff :*	
	(a) financial	51
	(b) technical	66
	(c) administrative & educational	25
	(d) Other	11

1	2	3
6	*No. of panchayats reporting having contributed for developoment programmes :*	
	(a) any	175
	(b) cash	138
	(c) labour	134
	(d) other	36
7	*Average contribution per reporting panchayat (in Rs.) :*	
	(a) cash	941·5
	(b) labour	762·9
	(c) other	88·4

*Particulars regarding 4 villages not available.

TABLE 15 —*Programmes for under-privileged classes in selected villages*

Sl. No.	Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1	2		3	4	5
1	No. of villages studied		180	219	399
2	*Drinking water wells :*				
	(a) No. of villages reporting existence		162	198	360
	(b) No. of wells in the villages	(A)	1001	2327	3328
		(B)	1140	2471	3611
	(c) Percentage of wells used by Harijans	(A)	49·2	41·6	42·0
		(B)	56·3	45·4	47·1
3	*Community centre:*				
	(a) No. of villages where established during block period.		71	60	131
	(b) Percentage of villages in which:				
	(i) all communities use these		81·7	86·7	84·0
	(ii) only caste Hindus alone use these		15·5	13·3	14·5
	(iii) caste Hindus & Harijans use separately		2·8	..	1·5
4	*Youth Clubs :*				
	(a) No. of villages where established during block period		66	79	145
	(b) Percentage of villages in which :				
	(i) all communities use these		65·2	84·8	75·9
	(ii) only Caste Hindus alone use these		31·8	15·2	22·8
	(iii) caste Hindus & Harijans use separately		3·0	..	1·4
5	*Women's Clubs :*				
	(a) No. of villages where established during the block period.		34	31	65
	(b) Percentage of villages in which:				
	(i) all communities use these		76·5	87·1	81·5
	(ii) only caste Hindus alone use these		20·6	12·9	16·9
	(iii) caste Hindus & Harijans use separately		2·9	..	1·5
6	*Schools :*				
	(a) No. of villages where facilities exist		136	137	273
	(b) Percentage of villages in which:				
	(i) all communities use these		94·1	91·2	92·7
	(ii) only caste Hindus alone use these		2·9	6·6	4·8
	(iii) caste Hindus & Harijans use separately		2·9	2·2	2·6
7	*Pavement of streets :*				
	(a) No. of villages reporting		14	9	23
	(b) Percentage of villages in which Harijans benefited		100·0	100·0	100·0
8	*Approach Roads :*				
	(a) No. of villages reporting		100	88	188
	(b) Percentage of villages in which Harijans benefited		97·0	98·7	97·2

1	2	3	4	5
9	*Loan funds* :			
	(a) No. of villages reporting	119	75	194
	(b) Percentage of villages in which given to:			
	(i) Harijans	35·3	26·7	32·0
	(ii) Other backward groups	35·3	36·0	35·6
	(c) Total amount given (in 000's Rs.) . . .	1021·0	224·2	1245·2
	(d) Percentage of loan funds given to:			
	(i) Harijans	6·9	6·8	6·9
	(ii) Other backward groups	18·2	7·1	16·2
10	*Shramdan* :			
	(a) No. of villges reporting	139	153	292
	(b) Percentage of villages where in free labour was given by.			
	(i) all communities	78·3	87·6	83·2
	(ii) by Harijans & backward classes only . .	1·6	0·6	1·0
	(iii) Harijans & backward groups did not participate.	10·1	4·6	7·2
	(c) Percentage of villages wherein Harijan etc. worked on reduced wages.	10·1	7·2	8·6
11	Percentage of villages wherein untouchability has gone down	53·8	51·2	51·9

(A) = Before the block period.
(B) = On the date of visit.

TABLE 16—*Cooperations with departments*

Sl. No.	Particulars			C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1	2			3	4	5
1	No. of BDO returns received			35	46	81
2	*No. of B.D.Os reporting* :					
	(i) That the Deptt. plans are broken to block level	For all deptts.. . .		14	19	33
		For Agri. Deptt. only .		11	9	20
		For Animal Husbandry Deptt. only.		2	2	4
		For Cooperation Deptt. only		6	5	11
		For no Deptt.		6	11	17
	(ii) That they participate in making of such plans	Yes		15	16	31
		No.—but they are kept informed about the plans of the normal deptts.	As BDO	7	12	19
			As member of BAC.	1	1	2
			Not informed	4	2	6
	(iii) Plans are made by pooling block & Deptt. resources . .	Yes		17	17	34
		No		16	28	44
		No knowledge . . .		1	..	1
		No reply		1	1	2
3	*No. of District Agricultural Officers reporting* :					
	(i) No. of Distt. Agri. officers returns received			31	40	71
	(ii) That Agri. Deptt. plans are broken down to block level	Yes		28	31	59
		No		3	7	10
	(iii) That BDO participates in making of such plans	Yes		20	24	44

1	2		3	4	5
	No—but kept informed of the plans	Yes	7	7	14
		No	1	..	1
(iv) Plans are made by pooling block & deptt. resources.	Yes		17	24	41
	No		12	15	27
	No knowledge		..	..	..
	No reply		2	1	3
4 *No. of District Cooperative Officers Reporting:*					
(i) No. of returns received			24	35	59
(ii) That Cooperative Deptt. plans are broken at block level	Yes		18	28	46
	No		4	3	7
(iii) BDO participates in the making of such plans.*	Yes		13	14	27
	No—but kept informed of the plans	Yes	5	11	16
		No	..	3	3
(iv) Plans are made by pooling block & deptt. resources.	Yes		15	11	26
	No		6	18	24
	No knowledge		..	1	1
	No reply		3	5	8
5. *No. of District Public Health Officers reporting:*					
(i) No. of returns received			27	30	57
(ii) That public Health Deptt. plans are broken at block level.	Yes		10	12	22
	No.		15	13	28
(iii) BDO participates in the making of such plans.	Yes		5	8	13
	No—but kept informed of the plans	Yes	5	4	9
		No	..	..	..
(iv) Plans are made by pooling block and deptt. resources.	Yes		10	8	18
	No		16	20	36
	No knowledge		..	1	1
	No reply		1	1	2

TABLE 17—*Pattern of Specialist visits to Villages and Gram Sevak Circles*

Sl. No.	Particulars	Specialists				
		Agriculture	Animal Husbandry	Public Health	Cooperation	Social Education (Male)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	No. of block returns received	68	38	39	63	71
2	No. of villages per specialist	119·4	88·0	110·2	125·4	69·4
3	No. of villages visited per month	16·7	13·3	14·8	15·1	17·4
4	No. of villages not visited during the last year	41·8	27·1	34·8	49·7	33·4
5	No. of Gram Sevak circles per specialist	9·6	9·8	8·5	10·2	5·6
6	No. of Gram Sevak circles visited per month	5·9	4·2	3·9	4·9	4·5
7	No. of Gram Sevak circles not visited during the last year	0·4	1·1	0·8	0·4	0·5

TABLE 18—*No. of specialists reporting performance in their field independent of Gram Sevak and reasons for the same*

Sl. No.	Particulars	Specialists: Agriculture	Animal Husbandry	Cooperation	Panchayats	Public Health & Sanitation	Social Education	Engineering	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	No. of Specialist returns received	68	38	63	21	39	71	31	331
2	No. reporting performance independent of Gram Sevaks	4	15	21	6	12	4	9	71
	(i) Services of Gram Sevak not always availed .	..	1	1	..	..	1	..	3
	(ii) Gram Sevaks have heavy work load . .	1	..	4	..	..	..	..	5
	(iii) Nature of work is technical and Gram Sevak has no technical training	..	13	8	..	6	2	9	38
	(iv) Gram Sevaks' assistance not needed	2	1	4	6	1	1	..	15
	(v) Area of Gram Sevak is too large . . .	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1
	(vi) Gram Sevak has failed to create confidence among villagers . .	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1
	(vii) Lack of coordination between Gram Sevak and the specialist .	1	..	4	..	2	..	..	7
	(viii) No reason given . .	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1

TABLE 19—*Suggestions by Specialist to improve performance of Gram Sevak*

Sl. No.	Particulars	Specialists: Agriculture	Animal Husbandry	Cooperation	Panchayat	Public Health & Sanitation	Social Education	Engineering	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	No. of specialists returns received	68	38	63	21	39	71	31	331
2	No. giving suggestions . .	57	31	56	15	25	54	19	257
3	No. giving specific suggestions to improve Gram Sevak's performance :								
	(i) Better technical knowledge	44	26	43	10	15	31	17	186
	(ii) Better approach to villagers	25	9	21	4	7	36	7	109
	(iii) Greater interest in job .	28	15	22	5	14	28	6	118
	(iv) Greater readiness to live in villages . . .	16	6	7	3	5	7	8	52
	(v) More village background .	10	2	6	2	2	9	2	33

TABLE 20—*Assistance by Specialist to Gram Sevaks, as reported by Gram Sevaks*

No. of Block returns received	36 CD	46 NES
No. of Gram Sevak returns received	176 CD	223 NES

Sl. No.	Particulars	Agriculture			Animal Husbandry			Public Health			Social Education			Overseer/Engineer		
		CD	NES	Total	CD	NES	Total	CD	NES	Total	CD	NES	Total	CD	NES	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1	No. of Gram Sevaks reporting . . .	173	206	379	122	133	255	137	103	240	170	218	358	44	77	121
2	Percentage saying specialists are of no assistance	6.9	10.7	9.0	13.9	24.1	19.2	14.6	30.1	21.2	5.9	10.1	8.2	6.8	9.1	8.3
3	Percentage who did not refer any problem .	13.9	23.3	19.0	41.8	46.6	44.3	43.8	61.2	51.2	22.9	39.0	32.0	40.9	45.4	43.8
4	Percentage who referred a problem .	86.1	76.7	81.0	58.2	53.4	55.7	56.2	37.9	48.3	77.1	60.6	67.8	54.5	50.6	52.1
5	Percentage who found the specialist's approach helpful	79.8	66.0	72.3	59.0	51.1	54.9	53.3	36.9	46.3	70.0	62.4	65.7	47.7	58.4	54.5

TABLE 21—*Frequency of visits of Gram Sevaks to non-headquarter villages and their night halts away from headquarters*

Sl. No.	Particulars	C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1	2	3	4	5
1	No. of block returns received	36	45	81
2	No. of Gram Sevaks canvassed	176	218	394
3	No. of non-headquarter villages per Gram Sevak	10.8	11.9	11.4
4	*No. of non-headquarter villages visited per Gram Sevak:*			
	(i) More than twice in last month	2.7	2.6	2.6
	(ii) Twice in last month	2.0	2.1	2.1
	(iii) Once in last month	3.2	3.2	3.2
	(iv) Not visited at all in the last month	2.8	4.1	3.5
	(v) More than 5 times during last quarter	3.2	3.4	3.3
	(vi) 3 to 5 times during last quarter	3.3	3.1	3.2
	(vii) 1 to 2 times during last quarter	2.7	2.9	2.8
	(viii) Not visited during last quarter	1.6	2.7	2.2
5	*No. of night halts per Gram Sevak in the last month:*			
	(i) At the block headquarter	2.8	3.5	3.2
	(ii) At non-headquarter villages	8.0	9.6	8.9
6	*Average time spent in days per month per Gram Sevak for:*			
	(i) Stay in block headquarter for staff meetings and other works	4.2	4.4	4.3
	(ii) Work in the headquarter village	6.9	6.9	6.9
	(iii) Work in non-headquarter villages	16.2	16.9	16.6
	(iv) Taking visitors round, etc.	0.9	0.8	0.9

TABLE 22— *Village level functionaries undertaking different activities as reported by Gram Sevak*

Sl. No.	Item	No. of blocks where Gram Sevaks canvassed	No. of blocks reporting function being performed by: Gram Sevak only	Gram Sevak plus single purpose worker	Single purpose worker only	None	No. of blocks reporting that item should: Continue with Gram Sevak	be added to Gram Sevak's duties	be deleted from Gram Sevak's duties	No. reply	Continue as at present
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Popularisation of improved seed, manure, etc.	79	58	21	..	..	67	1	..	7	4
2	Field demonstration	79	71	8	..	..	72	..	..	5	2
3	Plant protection	79	63	12	..	4	66	1	1	9	2
4	Irrigation	79	50	9	3	17	51	5	1	21	1
5	Soil conservation & reclamation	79	40	3	..	36	37	..	2	39	1
6	Vaccination of cattle	79	14	20	28	17	21	8	10	31	9
7	Construction of drinking water wells	79	57	20	1	1	64	1	5	6	3
8	Vaccination	79	11	12	44	12	18	14	2	38	7
9	Organisation of adult classes	79	58	18	1	2	66	2	1	8	2
10	Small saving drive	79	37	16	2	24	37	2	17	21	2
11	Organisation of shramdan	79	59	18	..	2	66	..	1	9	3

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
12	Act as Secretary of Panchayat	79	..	..	62	17	..	8	..	47	24
13	Collection of Panchayat Taxes .	79	..	14	41	24	6	1	6	52	14
14	Act as Secretary or supervisor of co-operative societies . .	79	..	6	63	10	2	10	4	48	15
15	Organisation of cooperative societies	79	41	19	12	7	45	4	2	20	8
16	Recovery of loans of co-operatives	79	3	11	49	16	8	4	9	43	15
17	Arrangement of loans for seeds & chemical fertilizers. .	79	51	15	6	7	54	4	2	17	2
18	Physical distribution of seeds, fertilizers, etc. . . .	79	26	12	26	15	21	10	14	26	8
19	Realisation of loans . .	79	7	8	42	22	5	2	9	49	14

TABLE 23—*Membership of B. A. C.*

Sl. No.	Particulars		C.D.	N.E.S.	Total
1		2	3	4	5
1	No. of blocks for which returns received	. . . .	32	43	75
2	Total No. of BAC members.	Maximum	318	264	318
		Minimum . . .	12	13	12
		Average (per block) .	52·3	54·8	53·7
3	No. of official members per block.	Dist. Level Tech. Officers	6·7	4·3	5·3
		Sub-Divisional Level Technical Officers .	1·7	3·1	2·4
		Block Level Staff . .	3·3	3·8	3·6
		Total (including Others)	14·9	15·7	15·3
4	No. of non-Official members per block.	M.Ps. & M.L.As. . .	3·3	2.8	3·0
		Representatives of panchayats . . .	17·6	19·9	18.9
		Total (including others)	37·4	39·0	38.3
5	Average No. of meetings held during the last one year (per block)	. . . . .	5·9	5·0	5·1

Tables on Chapter III—Acceptance of Practices

TABLE NO.	HEADING
1	Sample details of Acceptance of Practices Enquiry.
2	Extent of adoption in terms of relevant households.
3	Percentage of relevant households not adopting, reverting and not satisfied but not reverting for specified programmes.
4	Percentage of non-adoption and reversion by category of reasons for improved seeds.
5	Percentage of non-adoption and reversion by category of reasons for manures and fertilizers.
6	Percentage of non-adoption and reversion by category of reasons for improved methods of cultivation.
7	Percentage of non-adoption and reversion by category of reasons for improved implements.
8	Percentage of non-adoption and reversion by category of reasons for pesticides.
9	Percentage of dissatisfaction from adoption by category of reasons for specified programmes.
10	Percentage of non-adopting households reporting 'No knowledge.'
11	Extent of people's participation in community works (A.P. Repeat).
12	Extent of people's participation in community works (B.M.S.).

TABLE 1—*Sample details of A. P. Enquiry*

Sl. No.	Name of the State-block	No. of sample villages		No. of Sample house-holds	
		APR	APE	APR	APE
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Andhra—Kakinada	6	6	92	115
2	Assam—Arunachal	6	6	144	162
3	Bombay—Kolhapur	6	6	204	214
4	Bombay—Manavadar . . .	6	6	130	140
5	Bombay—Morsi	6	6	113	135
6	Himachal Pradesh—Theog* . .	9	10	101	111
7	Kerala—Chalakudy . . .	6	6	173	174
8	Madhya Pradesh—Rajpur . .	6	6	106	115
9	Madras—Erode	6	6	85	98
10	Mysore—Mandya	6	6	179	207
11	Orissa—Bhadrak	6	6	146	150
12	Punjab—Batala*	5	6	60	89
13	Rajasthan—Kotah	6	6	119	140
14	Uttar Pradesh—Bhathat . . .	6	6	161	166
15	West Bengal—Mohd. Bazar . .	10	10	141	160
	All	96	98	1954	2176

*One village dropped in the APR as sample families for canvassing turned out to be less than five.

TABLE 2—*Extent of Adoption in terms of Relevant Households*

All Blocks

Sl. No.	Programme Items	No. of relevant households		Extent of Adoption			Extent of adoption with facility		Extent of adoption without facility		Extent of adopting households who will continue if the facility is withdrawn		Extent of satisfaction for those who adopt		
		A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	Percentage growth (APE=100)	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	Percentage growth (APE=100)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
	Improved Seeds														
1	Paddy . .	1317	1415	56·1	28·3	198·2	8·3	6·9	44·0	21·1	5·2	3·4	45·8	23·1	198·3
2	Wheat . .	789	851	49·4	28·7	172·1	14·1	14·2	30·3	14·0	11·0	7·8	39·9	23·5	169·8
3	Cotton . .	466	518	91·4	58·5	156·2	14·6	25·7	70·0	32·6	12·2	11·0	70·4	44·6	157·8
4	Sugarcane . .	533	413	70·0	69·7	100·4	3·4	1·9	58·5	56·9	3·2	1·7	59·3	59·1	100·3
5	Jowar . .	285	357	53·0	22·7	233·5	1·1	0·8	42·8	21·6	0·7	0·8	43·2	22·4	192·8
6	Potato . .	291	230	45·4	18·3	248·1	2·1	8·3	27·1	8·3	1·0	3·0	33·7	8·7	387·4
	Manures & Fertilisers														
1	Ammonium Sulphate .	1844	1933	44·6	28·9	154·3	14·7	12·7	25·2	11·9	7·8	5·6	35·2	22·1	159·3
2	Super Phosphate .	1423	1298	17·2	9·4	183·0	7·5	6·8	5·5	2·5	2·7	3·2	9·5	7·7	123·4

3 Manure Mixture .	1290	1136	18·9	14·3	132·2	9·0	9·7	6·7	4·1	3·5	3·4	12·6	11·7	107.7
4 Compost Manure .	1721	1650	34·9	24·2	144·2	5·4	13·5	22·3	10·2	4·7	12·2	27·7	23·5	117.9
5 Green Manure .	1318	810	24·3	10·4	233·7	3·6	1·5	17·9	7·9	1·7	0·9	19·6	9·0	217.8
6 Oil Cake . .	972	926	31·1	16·5	188·5	3·2	2·4	22·7	12·5	2·3	1·4	26·1	15·1	172.8
Improved Methods of Cultivation														
1 Japanese Method.	1304	1129	15·3	2·7	566·7	6·4	2·1	8·3	0·5	2·4	1·2	11·3	2·0	565.0
2 Line Sowing .	736	760	55·4	49·1	112·8	2.0	4·5	49·3	44·6	1·8	3·9	50·0	48·8	102.5
3 Transplantation	490	302	76·3	29·1	262·2	2·2	1·0	69·4	26·2	1·4	1·0	72·7	26·8	271.3
4 Crop Rotation .	385	135	65·7	69·6	94·4	2·1	0·0	60·3	68·9	0·8	0·0	57·7	66·7	86.5
Improved Implements														
1 Improved Plough .	1296	*	20·7	*	=	1·2	*	17·4	*	0·8	*	18·6	*	=
2 Cotton Drill .	58	77	22·4	13·0	172·3	10·3	10·4	8·6	2·6	10·3	10·4	19·0	13·0	46.2
Pesticides														
1 Gammaxene .	1605	1556	13·8	4·9	281·6	8·5	3·9	3·3	0·8	5·3	1·5	11·0	3·9	282.1
2 Agroson . .	836	819	7·4	5·0	148·0	5·5	4·5	0·8	0·5	1·7	1·8	5·4	4·0	135.0

NOTE.—'*'—Comparative data for the programme 'Improved Plough' is not available in A. P. E.
'.'—Stands forindeterm inate.

TABLE 3—*Percentage of relevant households not adopting, reverting and not satisfied but not reverting for specified programmes*

All Blocks

Sl. No.	Programme Items	Relevant households		Percentage of house holds not adopting		Percentage of houses holds reverting		Percentage of house-holds not satisfied but not reverting	
		A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Improved Seeds								
1	Paddy	131·7	1415	44·0	71·7	9·5	3·0	1·0	@
2	Wheat	789	851	50·6	71·3	9·4	1·9	2·3	@
3	Cotton	466	518	8·6	41·5	12·0	9·7	2·6	@
4	Sugarcane	533	413	30·0	30·3	8·4	1·9	0·3	@
5	Jowar	285	357	47·0	77·3	13·7	0·6	0·4	@
6	Potato	291	230	54·6	81·7	13·4	1·7	1·1	@
	Manures & Fertilizers								
1	Ammonium Sulphate	1844	1933	55·4	71·1	14·4	5·8	0·2	@
2	Super Pho.pate	1423	1298	82·8	90·6	9·1	1·9	0·8	@
3	Manure Mixture	1290	1136	81·1	85·7	10·2	5·1	0·4	@
4	Compost	1721	1650	65·1	75·8	9·1	0·6	0·0	@
5	Green Manure	1318	810	75·7	89·6	7·8	2·2	0·3	@
6	Oil Cake	972	926	68·9	83·5	9·8	2·6	0.2	@

	Improved Methods of Cultivation								
1	Japanese method	1304	1129	84·7	97·3	3·7	0.0	0·5	@
2	Line Sowing	736	760	44·6	50·9	6·4	0.0	0·1	@
3	Transplantation	490	302	23·7	70·9	24·5	0.0	0·0	@
4	Crop rotation	385	135	34·3	30·4	8·3	0.0	0·5	@
	Improved Implements								
1	Improved plough	1296	@	79·3	@	3·9	@	0·0	@
2	Cotton Drill	58	77	77·6	87·0	13·8	@	*	@
	Pesticides								
1	Gammaxene	1605	1556	86·2	95·1	5·0	@	0·3	@
2	Agroson	836	819	92·6	95·0	3·7	@	0·2	@

NOTE.—'@' Comparable data for A.P.E. not available.
'*' No case of dissatisfactions.

TABLE 4—*Percentage of non-adoption and reversion by category of reasons for improved seeds@*

Seeds		No. of households		Lack of conviction of the Superiority of seed		Lack of financial resources		Lack of other resources		Failure of supply line		Irrigation difficulty		Others	
		A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R	A.P.E.
1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Paddy .	N	579	1014	39.6	34.2	3.5	4.4	1.6	1.7	8.1	3.5	4.0	4.8	21.6	22.6
	R	125	42	21.6	26.2	3.2	2.4	4.0	7.1	7.2	2.4	8.8	4.7	55.2	57.0
	T	704	1056	36.4	33.9	3.5	4.3	2.0	1.9	8.1	3.5	4.9	4.8	27.6	24.0
2. Wheat .	N	399	607	17.2	38.5	2.6	4.6	3.7	2.1	19.1	4.5	7.3	8.2	26.0	14.9
	R	74	16	24.4	37.5	2.7	12.5	0.0	0.0	13.5	12.5	9.4	6.3	50.0	31.3
	T	473	623	18.3	38.5	2.6	4.8	3.1	2.0	18.2	4.7	7.6	8.2	29.8	15.2
3. Cotton .	N	40	215	40.0	28.9	0.0	3.3	15.0	3.7	10.0	12.6	17.5	10.7	15.0	29.8
	R	56	50	21.4	40.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	1.8	22.0	10.7	14.0	64.3	24.0
	T	96	265	29.2	31.0	0.0	2.7	7.3	3.1	5.2	14.4	13.5	11.3	43.8	28.7
4. Sugarcane .	N	160	125	11.9	25.6	1.8	3.2	2.5	1.6	10.7	7.2	1.9	2.4	40.0	25.6
	R	45	8	24.4	12.5	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	11.1	25.0	53.4	62.5
	T	205	133	14.6	24.8	2.9	3.0	2.0	1.5	9.3	6.8	3.9	3.8	42.9	27.8
5. Jowar .	N	134	276	8.9	16.0	0.7	0.4	2.2	1.1	11.2	1.4	1.5	0.0	37.3	25.8
	R	39	2	23.1	0.0	2.6	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.6	100.0
	T	173	278	12.1	15.9	1.1	0.4	3.4	1.1	8.7	1.4	1.2	0.0	43.9	26.3

6. Potato	N	159	188	11·9	26·2	3·7	16·5	5·0	1·6	19·4	6·3	3·1	3·2	36·0	26·0
	R	39	4	30·7	100·0	2·6	0·0	0·0	0·0	12·8	0·0	5·1	0·0	48·8	0·0
	T	198	192	15·6	27·8	3·5	16·1	4·0	1·6	18·1	6·1	3·5	3·1	38·5	25·5
Total*	N	1471	2425	24·7	31·7	2·7	4·8	3·1	1·9	13·0	4·7	4·7	5·4	27·6	22·1
	R	378	122	23·6	34·4	2·9	2·5	2·4	2·5	7·1	11·5	8·2	9·8	55·8	39·3
	T	1849	2547	24·5	31·8	2·8	4·7	2·9	1·9	11·8	5·0	5·4	5·6	33·4	22·9

Note.— 'N'—Stands for households not adopting because of specific reason category as percentage to total non-adopting households.

'R'—Stands for households reverting because of specific reason category as percentage to total reverting households.

'T'—Stands for total households not adopting and reverting because of specific reason category as percentage to total non-adopting and reverting households.

'@'—These six categories of reasons explain total reversion but not total non-adoption, a part of it is accounted for by 'No knowledge' as shown in Table No. 10. This table excludes 'No knowledge'.

'*'—The figures given in the rows relevant for this item are based on the number of entries and not of households.

TABLE 5—*Percentage of non-adoption and reversion by category of reasons for manures and fertilizers@*

Sl. No.	Manure & Fertilizers		No. of households		Lack of conviction of the superiority of the fertilizers		Lack of financial resources		Failure of supply line		Others	
			A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.
1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Ammonium Sulphate .	N	1021	1374	23·5	22·8	30·8	28·2	3·8	2·4	37·3	26·7
		R	265	112	16·6	35·7	33·2	28·5	7·3	7·1	42·9	28·7
		T	1286	1486	22·0	23·8	31·3	28·2	4·4	2·7	38·4	26·8
2	Super Phosphate . .	N	1178	1176	14·3	18·8	21·2	13·6	5·1	3·3	33·1	28·3
		R	129	25	16·3	28·0	14·7	16·0	17·0	16·0	52·0	40·0
		T	1307	1201	14·5	19·1	20·6	13·7	6·3	3·6	35·0	28·6
3	Manure Mixture . .	N	1046	973	12·3	13·5	15·1	15·1	2·9	3·0	25·7	34·9
		R	132	58	25·8	27·5	13·6	12·0	11·3	15·5	49·3	45·0
		T	1178	1031	13·8	14·4	14·9	14·6	3·8	3·7	28·4	35·5
4	Compost . . .	N	1121	1251	10·1	13·5	1·1	3·4	2·2	5·4	60·0	54·3
		R	157	10	5·8	10·0	0·7	10·0	0·7	40·0	92·8	40·0
		T	1278	1261	9·5	13·5	1·0	3·4	2·0	5·6	64·0	54·2
5	Green Manure . .	N	998	726	15·5	31·5	3·5	2·1	8·9	5·1	48·5	30·3
		R	103	18	8·7	11·1	0·0	0·0	12·7	27·8	78·6	61·1
		T	1101	744	14·9	30·9	3·2	2·0	9·3	5·6	51·3	31·0

6 Oil Cake . . .	N	670	773	18·3	18·8	32·4	33·6	3·0	2·7	24·5	32·3
	R	95	24	5·3	8·3	26·3	29·2	2·1	0·0	66·3	62·5
	T	765	797	16·7	18·4	31·6	33·4	2·9	2·6	29·7	33·2
TOTAL* .	N	6034	6273	15·4	19·3	16·4	16·1	4·3	3·6	39·1	34·9
	R	881	247	13·8	27·5	17·1	20·6	8·2	12·1	60·9	39·8
	T	6915	6520	15·2	19·6	16·5	16·2	4·8	3·9	41·9	35·1

NOTE.— 'N'—Stands for households not adopting because of specific reason category as percentage to total non-adopting households.

'R'—Stands for households reverting because of specific reason category as percentage to total reverting households.

'T'—Stands for total households not adopting and reverting because of specific reason category as percentage to total non-adopting and reverting house-holds.

'@'—These four categories of reasons explain total reversion but not total non-adoption, a part of it is accounted for by 'No knowledge' as shown in Table 10. This table excludes 'No knowledge.'

'*'—The figures given in the rows relevant for this item are based on the number of entries and not of households.

13—2 Plan. Com./58

TABLE 6—*Percentage of non-adoption and reversion by category of reasons for improved methods of cultivation@*

Sl. No.	Methods		No. of households	Lack of conviction of the superiority of the methods	Lack of financial resources	Lack of other resources	Failure of supply line	Irrigation difficulty	Technical co-efficient of production	Others
1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Japanese method	N	1,105	10.7	9.1	2.9	0.2	4.3	18.1	23.4
		R	48	37.4	2.1	0.0	0.0	8.3	29.2	22.9
		T	1,153	11.8	8.8	2.8	0.2	4.4	18.6	23.3
2	Line sowing	N	328	13.1	2.4	2.1	1.2	1.5	15.9	39.7
		R	47	23.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	25.4	49.0
		T	375	14.4	2.1	1.9	1.1	1.6	17.1	40.8
3	Transplantation	N	116	19.0	4.3	8.6	0.0	9.4	29.3	14.7
		R	120	2.5	0.8	0.0	0.0	35.9	3.3	57.5
		T	236	10.6	2.5	4.2	0.0	23.9	16.1	36.5

4 Crop rotation	N	132	4.6	0.8	3.0	0.0	65.8	3.8	22.0
	R	32	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	15.6	40.7
	T	164	4.9	0.6	2.4	0.0	60.4	6.1	25.6
TOTAL*	N	1,681	11.2	6.8	3.2	0.4	8.9	17.4	25.9
	R	247	13.8	0.8	0.0	0.0	24.3	14.2	47.0
	T	1,928	11.6	6.0	2.7	0.3	10.9	17.0	28.5

NOTE:—The above data relates to A.P.R. only as comparable figures with regard to reversion were not available for A.P.E.

'N'—Stands for households not adopting because of specific reason category as percentage to total non-adopting households.

'R'—Stands for households reverting because of specific reason category as percentage to total reverting households.

'T'—Stands for total households not adopting and reverting because of specific reason category as percentage to total non-adopting and reverting households.

'@'—These seven categories of reasons explain total reversion but not total non-adoption, a part of it is accounted for by 'no knowledge' as shown in table No. 10. This table excludes 'no knowledge'.

'*'—The figures given in the rows relevant for this item are based on the number of entries and not of households.

TABLE 7—*Percentage of non-adoption and reversion by category of reasons for improved implements@*

Sl. No.	Implements		No. of households	Lack of conviction of the superiority of implements	Lack of financial resources	Lack of other resources	Failure of supply line	Technical co-efficient of production	Others
1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Improved plough	N	1,028	17.5	11.4	23.7	2.9	1.0	17.9
		R	50	0.0	12.0	14.0	4.0	2.0	68.0
		T	1,078	16.6	11.5	23.3	3.0	1.0	20.2
2	Cotton drill	N	45	31.1	22.2	0.0	17.8	4.4	24.5
		R	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	87.5
		T	53	26.4	18.9	0.0	15.1	5.7	34.0
	TOTAL*	N	1,073	18.0	11.9	22.7	3.5	1.1	18.3
		R	58	0.0	10.3	12.1	3.4	3.4	70.8
		T	1,131	17.1	11.8	22.2	3.5	1.2	21.0

NOTE.—The above data relate to A.P.R. only as comparable figures with regard to reversion were not available for A.P.E.
'N'—Stands for households not adopting because of specific reason category as percentage to total non-adopting households.
'R'—Stands for households reverting because of specific reason category as percentage to total reverting households.
'T'—Stands for total households not adopting and reverting because of specific reason category as percentage to total non-adopting and reverting households.

'@'—These six categories of reasons explain total reversion but not total non-adoption, a part of it is accounted for by 'No knowledge' as shown in Table No. 10. This table excludes 'No knowledge'.

'*'—The figures given in the rows relevant for this item are based on the number of entries and not of households.

TABLE 8—*Percentage of non-adoption and reversion by category of reasons for pesticides@*

Sl. No.	Pesticides		No. of households	Lack of conviction of the superiority of the pesticides	Lack of financial resources	Lack of other resources	Failure of supply line	Others
1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Gammaxene	N	1,384	28.9	2.5	0.1	4.3	11.8
		R	81	53.1	0.0	0.0	8.6	38.3
		T	1,465	30.2	2.4	0.1	4.5	13.2
2	Agroson	N	774	15.2	1.0	0.0	1.2	6.2
		R	31	16.0	0.0	0.0	32.2	51.8
		T	805	15.0	1.0	0.0	2.4	8.0
	TOTAL*	N	2,158	24.0	2.0	0.1	3.2	9.7
		R	112	42.8	0.0	0.0	15.2	42.0
		T	2,270	25.0	1.9	0.1	3.8	11.3

NOTE.—The above data relates to A.P.R. only as comparable figures with regard to reversion were not available for A.P.E.

'N'.—Stands for households not-adopting because of specific reason category as percentage to total non-adopting households.

'R'.—Stands for households reverting because of specific reason category as percentage to total reverting households.

'T'.—Stands for total households not adopting and reverting because of specific reason category as percentage to total non-adopting and revering households.

'*'.—The figures given in the rows relevant for this item are based on the number of entries and not of households.

'@'.—These five categories of reasons explain total reversion but not total non-adoption, a part of it is accounted for by 'no knowledge'as shown in Table 10. This table excludes 'no knowledge'.

TABLE 9—*Percentage of dissatisfaction by category of reasons for specified programmes. (Percentage to total dissatisfied).*

Programme items	No. of not satisfied households		Lack of conviction of the superiority of the material		Lack of financial resources		Irrigation difficulty		Others	
	APR	APE	APR	APE	APR	APE	APR	APE	APR	APE
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Improved seeds										
1. Paddy	56	61	57.1	65.6	0.0	0.0	10.7	0.0	32.2	34.4
2. Wheat	36	17	55.5	35.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	44.5	58.9
3. Cotton	39	43	61.5	48.8	0.0	0.0	15.4	0.0	23.1	51.2
4. Sugarcane	5	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	0.0
5. Jowar	3	@	33.3	@	0.0	@	0.0	@	66.7	@
6. Potato	22	14	72.7	64.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	35.7
TOTAL* . .	161	136	57.8	56.6	0.0	0.0	8.1	0.7	34.1	42.7
Manures & fertilizers										
1. Ammonium Sulphate . .	77	39	59.8	43.5	1.3	0.0	18.2	25.6	20.7	30.9
2. Super phosphate	30	17	83.3	58.9	0.0	0.0	6.7	23.5	10.0	17.6
3. Manure mixture	33	19	72.7	36.8	0.0	10.5	6.1	47.4	21.2	5.3
4. Compost	10	2	60.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
5. Green manure	22	4	27.2	50.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	25.0	45.5	25.0
6. Oil cake	3	3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	100.0
TOTAL* . .	175	84	61.7	45.2	0.6	2.4	13.7	28.6	24.0	23.8
Improved methods of cultivation										
1. Japanese method . . .	33	6	75.8	66.7	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.2	33.3
2. Line sowing	12	2	75.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
3. Transplantation	5	1	40.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
4. Crop rotation	15	@	60.0	@	0.0	@	13.3	@	26.7	@
TOTAL* . .	65	9	69.2	77.8	1.5	0.0	4.6	0.0	24.7	22.2

NOTE.—@ No case of dissatisfaction.

* The figures given in the rows relevant for this item are based on the number of entries and not of households.

TABLE 10—*Percentage of non-adopting households reporting 'No knowledge' for specified programmes*

Programme Items	No. of households not adopting		Percentage of non-adopting households reporting "No knowledge"	
	A.P.R.	A.P.E.	A.P.R.	A.P.E.
1	2	3	4	5
1. *Improved Seeds*				
(1) Paddy	579	1,014	21.6	28.9
(2) Wheat	399	607	24.2	27.2
(3) Cotton	40	215	2.5	11.1
(4) Sugarcane	160	125	31.2	34.4
(5) Jowar	134	276	38.2	55.4
(6) Potato	159	188	20.9	20.2
2. *Manures & Fertilizers*				
(1) Ammonium Sulphate	1,021	1,374	4.6	19.9
(2) Super Phosphate	1,178	1,176	26.3	36.0
(3) Manure Mixture	1,046	973	44.0	33.5
(4) Compost	1,121	1,251	26.6	23.4
(5) Green Manure	998	726	23.6	31.0
(6) Oil Cake	670	773	21.8	12.6
3. *Improved Methods of Cultivation*				
(1) Japanese Method	1,105	1,098	31.3	53.0
(2) Line Sowing	328	387	24.1	59.7
(3) Transplantation	116	214	14.7	1.4
(4) Crop Rotation	132	41	0.0	0.0
4. *Improved Implements*				
(1) Improved Plough	1,028	@	25.6	@
(2) Cotton Drill	45	67	0.0	6.0
5. *Pesticides*				
(1) Gammaxene	1,384	1,480	52.4	60.4
(2) Agroson	774	778	76.4	74.5

NOTE.—Comparable data not available for A.P.E.

TABLE 11—*Extent of people's participation (APR)*

Serial No.	State—Block	Roads								
		Household Participating in the work.	% of participating households to		% of participating households. contributing		Contribution per households		Contribution per contributing household	
			All the H.H.'s in the sample	Relevant H.H.'s in the sample	Labour.	Cash	Labour (Man-days)	Cash (Rs.)	Labour (Man-days)	Cash (Rs.)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	Andhra—Kakinada	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2	Assam—Arunachal	1	0.7	3.7	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	14.0
3	Bombay—Kolhapur	97	47.6	58.1	100.0	—	1.7	—	3.6	—
4	Bombay—Manavadar	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5	Bombay—Morsi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6	Himachal Pradesh—Theog	24	23.8	54.5	87.5	0.0	0.8	0.0	3.9	0.0
7	Kerala—Chalakudy	5	2.9	8.8	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	10.0
8	Madhya Pradesh—Rajpur	16	15.1	55.2	100.0	0.0	5.1	0.0	33.0	0.0
9	Madras—Erode	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10	Mysore—Mandya.	50	27.9	78.1	100.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	2.3	0.0
11	Orissa—Bhadrak	6	4.1	11.3	100.0	66.7	0.3	0.1	8.0	5.0

12	Punjab—Batala	37	61.7	97.4	100.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.8	0.0
13	Rajasthan—Kotah	27	22.7	65.8	85.2	18.5	2.0	0.5	10.2	11.8
14	Uttar Pradesh—Bhathat . . .	149	92.6	92.6	99.3	1.5	4.1	0.03	4.5	2.5
15	West Bengal—Mohd. Bazar . .	Nil	0.0	0.0	N. R.	N. R.	0.0	0.0	N. R.	N. R.
	All Blocks	412	21.1	58.9	96.6	3.2	1.1	0.1	5.3	8.3
	All Blocks excluding Theog . . .	388	20.9	59.2	97.2	3.4	1.1	0.1	5.4	8.3

TABLE 11 —*Extent of people's participation (APR)*—(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State—Block	School buildings								
		Households participating in the work	% of participating households to		% of participating houseolhds contributing		Contribution per household		Contribution per contributing household	
			All the households in the sample	Relevant households in the sample	Labour	Cash	Labour (Man-days)	Cash (Rs.)	Labour (Man-days)	Cash (Rs.)
1	2	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	Andhra—Kakinada	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2	Assam—Arunachal	17	11.8	63.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.1
3	Bombay—Kolhapur	31	15.2	30.7	100.0	3.2	0.9	0.4	6.2	75.0
4	Bombay—Manavadar	27	20.8	96.4	0.0	100.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	17.6
5	Bombay—Morsi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6	Himachal Pradesh—Theog	8	7.9	61.5	0.0	50.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	201.0
7	Kerala—Chalakudy	3	1.7	5.2	0.0	66.7	0.0	2.9	0.0	252.0
8	Madhya Pradesh—Rajpur	5	4.7	9.8	100.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	6.6	0.0
9	Madras—Erode	21	24.2	56.8	0.0	100.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	7.4
10	Mysore—Mandya	13	7.3	40.6	0.0	100.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	13.1
11	Orissa—Bhadrak	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
12	Punjab—Batala	*0	0.0	0.0	N. R.	N. R.	0.0	0.0	N.R.	N. R.

13	Rajasthan—Kotah	38	31.9	59.4	68.4	34.2	1.9	0.2	8.7	2.0
14	Uttar Pradesh—Bhathat	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
15	West Bengal—Mohd. Bazar	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	All Blocks	163	8.3	36.6	38.0	60.1	0.2	1.1	7.3	22.8
	All Blocks excluding Theog	155	8.4	35.8	40.0	60.6	0.2	0.8	7.3	15.2

TABLE 11 —*Extent of people's participation (APR)*—(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State—Block	Drinking water wells								
		Households participating in the work	% of participating households to		% of participating households contributing		Contribution per household		Contribution per contributing household	
			All the households in the sample	Relevant households in the sample	Labour	Cash	Labour (Man-days)	Cash (Rs.)	Labour (Man-days)	Cash (Rs.)
1	2	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
1	Andhra—Kakinada	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2	Assam—Arunachal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3	Bombay—Kolhapur	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
4	Bombay—Manavadar	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5	Bombay—Morsi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6	Himachal Pradesh—Theog	10	9.9	52.1	30.0	70.0	0.1	1.5	4.0	21.1
7	Kerala—Chalakudy	0*	0.0	0.0	N. R.	N. R.	0.0	0.0	N. R.	N. R.
8	Madhya Pradesh—Rajpur	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9	Madras—Erode	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10	Mysore—Mandya	5	2.8	17.2	20.0	80.0	0.01	0.02	1.0	1.0
11	Orissa—Bhadrak	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
12	Punjab—Batala	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
13	Rajasthan—Kotah	14	11.8	37.8	50.0	100.0	1.4	2.5	23.1	21.1

14 Uttar Pradesh—Bhathat	36	22.4	67.9	91.7	11.1	0.5	0.5	2.6	20.0
15 West Bengal—Mohd. Bazar	4	2.8	28.6	100.0	100.0	0.1	0.5	2.0	17.2
All Blocks	69	3.5	38.3	69.6	47.8	0.1	0.3	5.6	18.1
All blocks excluding Theog	59	3.2	36.6	76.3	44.1	0.1	0.2	5.7	17.3

TABLE 11—*Extent of people's participation* (*APR*)—(Concld.)

Sl. No.	State—Block	Any work								
		Households participating in the work	% of participating households to		% of participating households contributing		Contribution per household		Contribution per contributing household	
			All the households in the sample	Relevant households in the sample	Labour	Cash	Labour (Man-days)	Cash (Rs.)	Labour (Man-days)	Cash (Rs.)
1	2	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38
1	Andhra—Kakinada	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2	Assam—Arunachal	43	29.9	78.2	60.5	39.5	0.4	0.3	2.2	2.2
3	Bombay—Kolhapur	134	65.7	65.7	100.0	0.8	4.0	0.4	6.0	75.0
4	Bombay—Manavadar	87	66.9	94.6	1.2	96.6	0.2	12.7	27.0	19.7
5	Bombay—Morsi	0*	0.0	0.0	N. R.	N. R.	0.0	0.0	N. R.	N. R.
6	Himachal Pradesh—Theog	38	37.6	50.0	71.1	29.0	1.1	9.4	4.2	86.5
7	Kerala—Chalakudy	15	8.7	10.5	0.0	66.7	0.0	3.2	0.0	55.1
8	Madhya Pradesh—Rajpur	20	18.9	39.2	90.0	10.0	5.4	0.2	31.6	12.5
9	Madras—Erode	21	24.7	48.8	0.0	100.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	7.4
10	Mysore—Mandya	70	39.1	56.9	72.9	25.7	0.6	1.0	2.2	10.3
11	Orissa—Bhadrak	6	4.1	7.6	100.0	66.7	0.3	0.1	8.0	5.0

12	Punjab—Batala	37	61.7	97.4	100.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.8	0.0
13	Rajasthan—Kotah	82	68.9	68.9	67.1	58.5	6.2	3.6	13.3	9.0
14	Uttar Pradesh—Bhathat	149	92.6	92.6	99.3	15.4	6.6	1.3	7.1	9.1
15	West Bengal—Mohd. Bazar	4	2.8	12.1	100.0	100.0	0.1	0.5	2.0	17.2
	All Blocks	706	36.1	55.6	71.8	34.4	1.8	2.2	7.1	18.0
	All blocks excluding Theog	668	36.1	55.9	71.9	34.7	1.9	1.8	7.3	14.7

NOTE.—'—' denotes that the programme was not sponsored.

'N. R.' Stands for not relevant as no household participated in the works.

'*' The programme was sponsored in only one sample village but no household participated.

TABLE 12—*Extent of people's participation (B.M.S. data—Cultivators only)*

Sl. No.	State—Block	Roads								
		No. of households participating in the work	% of participating households to		% of participating households contributing		Contribution per household		Contribution per contributing household.	
			All house holds in the sample	Relevant households in the sample	Labour	Cash	Labour (Man-days)	Cash (Rs.)	Labour (Man-days)	Cash (Rs.)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	Andhra—Kakinada	5	0.8	5.7	...	100.0	...	0.5	...	55.2
2	Assam—Arunachal	55	9.5	10.3	94.5	7.3	0.6	0.01	6.1	1.8
3	Bombay—Kolhapur	971	96.4	96.4	99.3	1.5	16.2	0.2	16.9	12.4
4	Bombay—Manavadar	316	50.7	54.2	62.7	99.7	0.2	1.8	0.7	3.6
5	Bombay—Morsi	23	3.5	11.4	0.0	91.3	0.0	0.9	0.0	28.8
6	Kerala—Chalakudy	35	4.1	5.0	5.7	34.3	0.02	0.8	8.5	56.7
7	Madhya Pradesh—Rajpur	126	26.3	85.1	99.2	0.8	1.5	0.01	5.8	4.0
8	Madras—Erode	78	14.2	22.7	79.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	4.1	0.0
9	Mysore—Mandya	146	13.7	21.1	96.6	3.4	0.4	0.02	3.3	5.0
10	Orissa—Bhadrak	116	20.5	42.5	99.1	0.0	0.4	0.0	2.1	0.0
11	Punjab—Batala	263	69.6	84.6	100.0	1.5	5.0	0.1	7.2	10.0
12	Rajsthan—Kotah	157	28.9	75.8	100.0	0.6	0.9	0.002	3.0	1.0
13	Uttar Pradesh—Bhathat	498	67.6	67.6	99.2	0.4	1.4	0.01	2.1	3.5
14	West Bengal—Mohd. Bazar	102	16.4	28.3	96.1	3.9	0.2	0.02	1.5	3.5
	All Blocks	2,891	31.2	46.7	92.4	13.5	2.4	0.3	8.2	7.7

TABLE 12— *Extent of people's participation (B.M.S. data—Cultivators only)*—(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State—Block	School Buildings								
		No. of households participating in the work	% of participating households to		% of participating households Contributing		Contribution per households		Contribution per Households Contributing	
			All households in the sample	Relevant households in the sample	Labour	Cash	Labour (Man-days)	Cash (Rs.)	Labour (Man-days)	Cash (Rs.)
1	2	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	Andhra—Kakinada	50	8.2	25.1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	5.2
2	Assam—Arunachal	13	2.3	6.6	92.3	7.7	0.1	0.01	2.2	5.0
3	Bombay—Kolhapur	10	1.0	3.2	70.0	60.0	0.02	0.02	2.6	4.2
4	Bombay—Manvadar	19	3.0	4.7	0.0	94.7	0.0	0.1	0.0	4.9
5	Bombay—Morsi	109	16.4	24.0	0.0	97.3	0.0	3.8	0.0	24.0
6	Kerala—Chalakudy	16	1.9	3.8	6.3	87.5	0.002	0.6	2.0	34.4
7	Madhya Pradesh—Rajpur	43	9.0	22.2	90.7	83.7	1.4	0.6	17.4	8.0
8	Madras—Erode	2	0.4	2.1	100.0	0.0	0.01	0.0	2.0	0.0
9	Mysore —Mandya	158	14.9	52.7	0.0	95.6	0.0	0.7	0.0	4.8
10	Orissa—Bhadrak	116	20.5	36.0	77.6	69.8	1.7	1.3	10.7	8.9
11	Punjab—Batala	54	14.3	42.5	92.6	81.5	0.3	1.7	1.9	14.6
12	Rajasthan—Kotah	113	20.8	55.9	41.6	58.4	0.3	2.0	3.6	16.3
13	Uttar Prasdesh—Bhathat	30	4.1	8.4	3.3	40.0	0.003	0.1	2.0	4.1
14	West Bengal—Mohd. Bazar	57	9.2	18.8	17.5	73.7	0.1	1.3	3.7	19.2
.	All Blocks	790	8.5	11.5	32.8	79.4	0.2	1.0	7.7	15.5

TABLE NO. 12—*Extent of people's participation (B.M.S. data—Cultivators only)*—(Contd.)

Sl. No.	State—Block	Any Work: No. of households participating in the work	% of participating households to: All households in the sample	% of participating households to: Relevant households in the sample	Contribution per household: Labour (Man-days)	Contribution per household: Cash (Rs.)
1	2	21	22	23	24	25
1	Andhra—Kakinada	55	9.0	27.6	0.0	0.9
2	Assam—Arunachal	70	12.2	13.1	0.6	0.02
3	Bombay—Kolhapur	971	96.4	96.4	17.0	0.2
4	Bombay—Manavadar	355	53.8	53.8	0.3	2.6
5	Bombay—Morsi	217	32.7	47.7	0.3	5.4
6	Kerala—Chalakudy	74	8.7	8.7	0.1	1.8
7	Madhya Pradesh—Rajpur	204	42.5	80.3	3.2	3.6
8	Madras—Erode	80	14.6	14.6	0.6	0.004
9	Mysore—Mandya	370	34.8	41.3	1.1	0.8
10	Orissa—Bhadrak	251	44.4	50.5	2.5	1.4
11	Punjab—Batala	264	69.8	84.9	6.4	2.5
12	Rajasthan—Kotah	428	78.8	84.1	1.8	3.8
13	Uttar Pradesh—Bhathat	541	73.4	73.4	1.5	0.1
14	West Bengal—Mohad. Bazar	210	33.8	45.5	0.6	2.3
	All Blocks	4,070	43.9	23.1	2.9	1.7

Data are not available for contribution in terms of per contributing household.

Tables on Chapter IV—Panchayat Study

HEADING

TABLE NO.

1. Panchayats in evaluation centres: Total and selected.
2. Details of respondents interviewed.
3. Percentage distribution of panchayat-members by age groups, educational qualifications, caste, social and economic status.
4. Panchayat secretaries: Educational qualifications, training emoluments and jurisdiction etc.
5. Income and expenditure of selected panchayats.
6. Development expenditure incurred in the selected panchayats.
7. No. of panchayats taking up different development activities.
8. Attitude towards panchayat taxes.
9. Suggestions for augmenting the resources of panchayats.
10. Percentage of respondents reporting panchayats as useful or not useful, etc.
11. Suggestions given by the respondents to improve the day-to-day functioning of panchayats.
12. No. of respondents giving first or second priority to financial, technical and administrative aid to improve the functioning of panchayats.
13. Attitude towards giving the panchayats more powers, by specific items.

TABLE 1—*Panchayats in Evaluation Centres: Total and Selected*

Sl. No.	Centre/State	Total population of the Block (in 000's)	Single Village Panchayats		Multi-Village Panchayats			Average population per panchayat (Single village & multi-village (in 000's.)	No. of Panchayats selected for study.				
									Single-Village Panchayats		Multi-village Panchayats		
			Number	Population covered (in 000's)	Number	Number of villages covered.	Population covered (in 000's)		Number	Population covered (in 000's)	Number	No. of villages covered	Population covered (in 000's)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	Bodhan (Hyderabd) . . .	86.9	9	20.4	Nil	Nil	Nil	2.3	2	5.6	Nil	Nil	Nil
2	Cachar (Assam) . . .	118.8	Nil	Nil	N. A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Nil	Nil	2	13	6.5
3	Pusa (Bihar) . . .	72.1	8	21.1	16	62	43.0	2.7	2	6.0	2	5	5.1
4	Kolhapur (Bombay) . . .	109.0	46	71.5	25	64	36.8	1.5	4	7.8	2	6	3.0
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra) . .	76.2	58	76.2	Nil	Nil	Nil	1.3	5	3.6	Nil	Nil	Nil
6	Morsi (M.P.) . . .	59.4	36	42.7	4	18	8.1	1.3	2	2.4	2	14	4.7
7	Erode (Madras) . . .	229.7	34	125.5	8	22	30.8	3.7	2	6.7	2	7	10.5
8	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat) . .	84.2	2	4.5	29	126	72.9	2.4	2	4.5	2	7	3.9
9	Bhadrak (Orissa) . . .	98.4	Nil	Nil	15	576	98.4	6.6	Nil	Nil	2	45	11.8
10	Batala (Punjab) . . .	88.2	54	47.6	32	80	40.5	1.0	3	2.4	2	4	3.1
11	Sonepat (Punjab) . . .	98.2	51	74.8	17	37	23.4	1.4	2	2.7	2	5	1.5
12	Chalakudy (Kerala) . . .	165.1	2	24.0	9	25	141.1	15.0	1	13.3	2	5	32.6
13	Bhathat (U.P.) . . .	128.0	129	103.7	26	67	24.3	0.8	5	8.1	1	2	0.9
14	Mandya (Mysore) . . .	96.8	101	94.9	1	2	1.8	0.9	4	2.4	1	2	1.8
15	Ashta (Bhopal) . . .	83.0	Nil	Nil	43	286	70.1	1.6	Nil	Nil	4	26	6.3
	TOTAL . . .	1587.0	480	706.9	225	1,365	591.2	1.8	34	65.5	26	141	91.7

Table No. 2—Details of the respondents interviews

Serial Number	Centre/State	No. of Panchayats Studied	Number of Respondents Interviewed by type								
			Knowledgeable							Non-knowledgeable respondents	Grand Total
			VLWS	Presidents	Panchayats Secretaries	Panchayats Members	Defeated Candidates	Others	Total		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad)	2	2	2	2	4	2	6	18	10	28
2	Cachar (Assam)	2	2	1	2	9	..	4	18	30	48
3	Pusa (Bihar)	4	4	4	4	14	1	7	34	35	69
4	Kolhapur* (Bombay)	6	6	6	6	15	7	24	64	40	104
5	Manavadar (Saurasthra)	5	5	5	1	8	3	7	29	22	51
6	Morsi (M. P.)	4	4	4	3	12	9	14	46	34	80
7	Erode (Madras)	4	4	4	..	8	5	10	31	40	71
8	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat)	4	4	4	3	14	4	13	42	40	82
9	Bhadrak (Orissa)	2	2	2	2	8	1	5	20	30	50
10	Batala (Punjab)	5	5	5	4	12	1	12	39	35	74
11	Sonepat (Punjab)	4	4	4	4	13	2	13	40	34	74
12	Chalakudy (Kerala)	3	5	3	3	9	12	9	40	90	13
13	Bhathat (U. P.)	6	4	5	2	17	7	2	37	30	67
14	Mandya (Mysore)	5	5	5	..	10	..	6	26	27	43
15	Ashta (Bhopal)	4	2	4	2	20	3	14	45	54	99
	TOTAL	60	58	58	37	173	57	146	529	551	1,080

TABLE 3—*Percentage distribution of panchayat members by age-groups, educational qualifications, caste, economic and Social status*

Sl. No.	Centre/State	No. of panchayats studied	No. of Members	Age-groups (Years)			Educational Qualifications					Caste		Land Ownership		Wealth		Whether respected				Who are also Village leaders
				1-25	25-40	40 & above	Illiterate	Primary	Middle	Matric	Above Matric	High	Low	with	without	Richer class	Others	Generally	By the faction only	By other	Not respected	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad)	2	13	..	*15·4	*53·9	23·1	30·8	7·7	23·1	15·4	69·2	30·8	76·9	23·1	61·5	38·5	61·5	30·8	7·7	..	23·1
2	Cachar (Assam)	2	19	..	47·6	52·6	..	52·6	26·3	15·8	5·3	100·0	..	84·2	15·8	10·5	89·5	57·8	42·1	..	..	63·2
3	Pusa (Bihar)	4	43	2·3	46·5	51·2	11·6	44·2	37·2	2·3	4·7	83·7	16·3	88·6	11·6	14·0	86·0	62·8	34·8	..	2·3	2·3
4	Kolhapur (Bombay)	6	44	4·5	34·1	61·4	25·0	27·3	43·2	4·5	..	77·3	22·7	97·7	2·3	45·5	54·5	79·5	13·6	2·3	4·5	36·4
5	Manavadar (Saurasthra)	5	40	..	32·5	67·5	45·0	32.5	22·5	..	..	35·0	65·0	65·0	35·0	60·0	40·0	90·0	10·0	..	..	17·5
6	Morsi (M.P.)	4	49	2·3	61·2	36·7	12·2	48.3	30·6	4·1	4·1	75·5	24·5	89·8	10·2	6·1	93·8	10·2	32·7	2·0	55·1	12·2
7	Erode (Madras)	4	22	..	54·5	45·5	68·2	22·7	4·5	..	4·5	95·5	4·5	59·1	40·9	54·6	54·4	90·9	9·1	..	..	N.A.
8	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat)	4	40	..	47·5	52·5	40·0	40·0	20.0	..	..	70·0	30·0	60·0	40.0	57·5	42·5	55·0	32·5	10·0	2·5	35·9
9	Bhadrak (Orissa)	2	7	..	42·9	57·1	..	85·7	..	14·4	..	85·7	14·3	100·0	..	14·3	85·7	42·9	28·6	..	28·6	..
10	Batala (Punjab)	5	19	..	15·8	84·2	57·9	10·5	21·1	10·5	..	84·2	15·8	84·2	15·8	52·6	74·4	21·1	57·9	15·8	5·3	68·4
11	Sonepat (Punjab)	4	18	..	27·8	72·2	77·8	11·1	11·1	..	..	66·7	33·3	77·8	22·2	44·4	55·6	55·6	33·3	5·6	5·5	27·8
12	Chalakudy (Kerala)	3	20	..	40·0	60·0	..	65·0	30·0	5·0	..	60·0	40·0	95·0	5·0	40·0	60·0	30·0	45·0	25·0	..	30·0
13	Bhathat (U.P.)	6	109	..	43·1	56·9	58·7	40·4	..	0·1	..	62·4	37·6	100·0	..	14·7	85·3	78·0	22·0	..	..	11·0
14	Mandya (Mysore)	5	51	..	29·4	70·6	52·9	41·2	5·9	..	..	76·5	23·5	100·0	..	21·6	78·4	37·3	58·8	3·9	..	27·5
15	Ashta (Bhopal)	4	53	3·8	22·6	73·6	77·4	15·1	7·6	..	..	58·5	41·5	98·1	1·9	49·1	50·9	20·8	66·0	11·3	1·9	2·8
	TOTAL	60	547	1·1	38·9	59·6	42·2	36·4	17·0	2·9	1·5	69·8	30·2	88·1	11·9	32·5	67·5	55·2	33·8	4·4	6·6	21·9

N.A.—Not Available.
*Age-group of 4 members is not available.
Note.—In Manavadar block the low caste is dominant land owning group.

TABLE 4— *Panchayat Secretaries : Educational qualifications, training emoluments and jurisdiction etc.*

Sl. No.	Centre/State	No. of Panchayats studied	No. of Secretaries	Educational Qualifications: Primary	Middle	Matric	Above Matric	Whether received training Trained (T) Un-trained (U)	Total Emolu-ments re-ceived by each Secretary (in rupees)	Whether a part-time or a full time em-ployee Part-time (P) Full-time (F)	Jurisdiction Single Panchayat (S) or group of Panchayats) (G)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad) . .	2	2	1	1	..	..	2 U†	15	2 P	2 S
2	Cachar (Assam) . .	2	2	..	..	2	..	1 T 1 U	25	2 P	2 S
3	Pusa (Bihar) . . .	4	4	..	1	3	..	4 T	40	4 F*	4 S
4	Kolhapur (Bombay) . .	6	6	1	5	..	..	6 T	15 to 35	4 P 2 F	6 S
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra) .	5	5	..	4	..	1	5 T	86	5 F*	5 G
6	Morsi (M. P.) . . .	4	4	..	3	1	..	4 T	50	4 F*	4 G
7	Erode (Madras) . . .	4	No secretaries in Class II panchayats.								
8	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat) .	4	3	2	1	..	..	3 U†	10	3 P	3 S
9	Bhadrak (Orissa) . .	2	2	..	1	1	..	1 T 1 U	20 to 50	2 F	2 S
10	Batala (Punjab) . .	5	5	..	1	3	1	5 T	70	5 F	5 G
11	Sonepat (Punjab) . .	4	4	..	3	1	..	4 T	60	4 F	4 G
12	Chalakudy (Kerala) . .	3	3	..	..	1	2	3 T	91 to 108	3 F*	3 S
13	Bhathat (U. P.) . .	6	6	..	6	..	..	6 T	64 to 86	6 F*	6 G
14	Mandya (Mysore) . .	5	N.P.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	TOTAL . .	56	46	4	26	12	4	46	..	46	46

N. P. No provision for panchayat secretary.
* The Panchayat Secretary is a full-time Government Servant.
† No provision for the training of panchayat secretaries.

TABLE 5— *Income and Expenditure of the selected panchayats*

Sl. No.	Centre/State	No. of Panchayats Studied	Total population of the selected Panchayats	Total Annual Income of the Selected Panchayats from regular sources (Average of the last 3 years)	Income per capita Percentage from: Independent sources	Regular Govt. Grants	Total per capita Income from regular sources	Per capital Income from independent sources	Percentage of Administrative Expenditure to total annual income from regular Sources	Per Capita income available for development activities from independent sources after meeting administrative expenditure
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
				Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad) . . .	2	5,610	10,377	8,431 (81.3)	1,946 (18.7)	1.85	1.50	1,308 (12.6)	1.27
2	Cachar (Assam)	†1	29,690	8,913	1,978 (22.2)	6,935 (77.8)	0.30	0.07	5,925 (65.9)	0.13
3	Pusa (Bihar)	4	11,114	6,768	6,778 (100.0)	Nil.	0.61	0.61	983 (15.1)	0.52
4	Kolhapur (Bombay)	6	10,756	17,287	8,559 (49.5)	8,726 (50.5)	1.66	0.80	6,956 (40.2)	0.15
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra) . . .	5	3,610	12,944	1,299 (10.0)	11,645 (90.0)	3.59	0.36	4,826 (37.3)	0.98
6	Morsi (M. P.)	4	7,114	6,619	6,619 (100.0)	Nil.	0.93	0.93	4,051 (61.2)	0.36

7	Erode (Madras)	4	17,163	29,136	29,136 (100.0)	Nil	1.64	1.64	4,674 (15.1)	1.37
8	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat)	4	8,367	3,721	3,721 (100.0)	Nil	0.43	0.43	1,159 (31.1)	0.29
9	Bhadrak (Orissa)	2	11,814	2,017	2,017 (100.0)	Nil	0.17	0.17	1,557 (77.7)	0.04
10	Batala (Punjab)	5	5,517	4,123	3,125 (75.8)	998 (24.2)	0.75	0.57	1,279 (31.0)	0.34
11	Sonepat (Punjab)	4	4,185	6,631	5,733 (86.5)	898 (13.5)	1.58	1.37	1,285 (19.4)	1.07
12	Chalakudy (Kerala)	3	45,998	37,941	32,476 (85.6)	5,465 (14.4)	0.82	0.71	14,718 (38.8)	0.39
13	Bhathat (U. P.)	4*	8,091	1,657	1,657 (100.0)	Nil	0.20	0.20	281 (17.0)	0.17
14	Mandya (Mysore)	5	4,219	1,431	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
15	Ashta (Bhopal)	4	6,271	7,538	6,150 (81.6)	1,388 (18.4)	1.20	0.98	2,455 (32.6)	0.59

*The number of panchayats studied in the block is six but the information on financial resources, etc., could be available for four selected panchayats only.

†Income and Expenditure data for Cachar (Assam) relates to the Rural Panchayat which besides the 2 selected primary panchayats includes 3 other primary panchayats as well.

NOTE.—Figures within brackets are percentages.

TABLE 6—*Development Expenditure incurred in the selected Panchayats*

(Annual Average for 3 years— 1954-1955 to 1956-57)

Sl. No.	Centre/State	No. of Panchayats studied	Papulation covered	Total Development Expenditure incurred in the selected Panchayats (Average of the last 3 years)	Contribution of different sources towards the development expenditure				Per Capita Development Expenditure	Per Capita expenditure from different sources			
					Contribution by the Panchayat	*Adhoc*-contribution from the people	Contribution by the Project	Any other Government grant		Contribution by the Panchayat	*Adhoc*-contribution from the people	Contribution by the Project	Any other Government grant
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
				(Rs.)	(Rs.)	(Rs.)	(Rs).	(Rs.)	(Rs.)	(Rs.)	(Rs.)	(Rs.)	(Rs.)
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad) . . .	2	5,610	19,651	1,609 (8.2)	2,858 (14.6)	9,340 (47.5)	5,844 (29.7)	3.50	0.29	0.51	1.66	1.04
2	Cachar (Assam)	2	6,520	7,137	510 (7.1)	1,539 (21.6)	Nil	5,088 (71.3)	1.09	0.08	0.24	Nil	0.78
3	Pusa (Bihar)	4	11,114	12,663	4,525 (35.7)	2,212 (17.4)	2,133 (16.9)	3,793 (30.0)	1.14	0.41	0.20	0.19	0.34
4	Kolhapur (Bombay) . . .	6	10,756	10,956	1,988 (17.8)	4,805 (43.8)	3,447 (31.5)	6,746 (6.9)	1.02	0.18	0.44	0.32	0.07
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra) . .	5	3,610	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
6	Morsi (M. P.)	4	7,114	3,548	3,190 (89.9)	83 (2.3)	Nil	275 (7.8)	0.50	0.45	Nil	Nil	0.05
7	Erode (Madras)	4	17,163	30,442	9,106 (29.9)	417 (1.4)	19,983 (65.6)	936 (3.1)	1.77	0.53	0.02	1.16	0.06

8	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat)	4	8,367	10,844	788 (7.3)	3,659 (33.7)	5,080 (46.9)	1,317 (12.1)	1.30	0.09	0.44	0.61	0.16
9	Bhadrak (Orissa)	2	11,814	31,299	184 (0.6)	3,853 (12.3)	12,003 (38.3)	15,259 (48.8)	2.65	0.02	0.33	1.02	1.29
10	Batala (Punjab)	5	5,517	6,219	2,168 (34.9)	363 (5.8)	3,538 (56.9)	150 (2.4)	1.13	0.39	0.07	0.64	0.03
11	Sonepat (Punjab)	4	4,185	11,425	8,188 (71.7)	1,568 (13.7)	1,669 (14.6)	Nil	2.73	1.96	0.37	0.40	Nil
12	Chalakudy (Kerala)	3	45,998	37,865	30,771 (81.3)	1,833 (9.8)	Nil	5,261 (13.9)	0.82	0.67	0.04	Nil	0.11
13	Bhathat (U. P.)	6	8,985	13,593	2,515 (18.5)	7,815 (57.5)	3,263 (24.0)	Nil	1.51	0.28	0.87	0.36	Nil
14	Mandya (Mysore)	5	4,219	8,625	817 (9.5)	5,867 (68.0)	1,181 (13.7)	760 (8.8)	2.05	0.19	1.39	0.28	0.19

NOTE.—Figures within brackets are percentages.

TABLE 7— *Number of Panchayats taking up different development activities*

Sl. No.	Centre/State	No. of Panchayats studied	Civic Amenities				Social Education Programme					Improvement of communications		Provision of Irrigation facilities		Provision of cottage industries	Reclamation of village land	Construction or repair of community buildings			Others	
			Lighting & sweeping	Provision of drinking water facilities	Provision of latrines, drains, gutters & pavements of streets	Smoke less chulhas & ventilators	Youth Clubs	Women Clubs	Adult literacy centres	Libraries & community centres	Organisation of Melas, games, Vanmahotsavas, Bhajan Mandalies, Baby shows, etc.	Construction & repair of roads	Construction of culverts	Construction of irrigation bunds	Construction of tube-wells			School building	Panchyat ghars	Childrens Park	Distribution of medicines	Relief to poor & Harijans.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad)	2	2	...	1	...	1	...	...	1	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
2	Cachar (Assam)	2	...	1	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	...
3	Pusa (Bihar)	4	3	2	1	...	...	...	2	2	2	4	...	...	...	1	...	2	...	...	1	...
4	Kolhapur (Bombay)	6	4	...	2	...	...	1	1	4	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra)	5	5	4	...	...	...	1	...	5	2	4	...	1	...	1	...	1	1	...	4	3
6	Morsi (M. P.)	4	1	3	...	...	...	...	...	3	2	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	1
7	Erode (Madras)	4	2	2	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	3	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...

8 Rajpur (Madhya Bharat)	4	3	2	2	1	...	...	...	3	2	4	...	...	...	...	1	2	...	...	...	...
9 Bhadrak (Orissa)	2	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
10 Batala (Punjab)	5	...	5	5	3	...	...	3	3	2	5	...	...	...	1	...	5	...	3	...	...
11 Sonepat (Punjab)	4	2	2	2	...	1	...	1	1	2	1	...	...	...	...	3	2	...	...	...	...
12 Chalakudy (Kerala)	3	3	2	3	...	1	...	...	3	...	3	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
13 Bhathat (U. P.)	6	1	2	1	...	...	...	1	...	1	6	2	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...
14 Mandya (Mysore)	5	1	...	1	...	...	...	...	1	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	...	...
TOTAL	56	27	26	19	4	3	2	9	26	15	40	3	3	1	3	4	16	1	4	9	5

TABLE 8—*Attitude towards Panchayat Taxes*

Sl. No.	Centre/State	No. of Panchayats studied	No. of Respondents interviewed	House Tax: % age of respondents reporting people's resistance to tax	House Tax: % age of Respondents expressing their own Resistance towards the tax: Knowledgeable	House Tax: % age of Respondents expressing their own Resistance towards the tax: Non-knowledgeable	House Tax: % age of Respondents expressing their own Resistance towards the tax: Total	Land Cess: %age of respondents reporting people's resistance to tax	Land Cess: % age of Respondents expressing their own Resistance towards the tax: Knowledgeable	Land Cess: % age of Respondents expressing their own Resistance towards the tax: Non-knowledgeable	Land Cess: % age of Respondents expressing their own Resistance towards the tax: Total	Licence Fees: % age of Respondents reporting People's Resistance to the tax	Licence Fees: % age of Respondents expressing their own Resistance towards the tax: Knowledgeable	Licence Fees: % age of Respondents expressing their own Resistance towards the tax: Non-knowledgeable	Licence Fees: % age of Respondents expressing their own Resistance towards the tax: Total	Labour Tax: % age of respondents reporting peoples' Resistance to the tax	Labour Tax: % age of Respondents expressing their own Resistance towards the tax: Knowledgeable	Labour Tax: % age of Respondents expressing their own Resistance towards the tax: Non-knowledgeable	Labour Tax: % age of Respondents expressing their own Resistance towards the tax: Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad)	2	28	50.0	Nil	40.0	14.3	x	x	x	x	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	x	x	x	x
2	Cachar (Assam)	2	48	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	2.1	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	x	x	x	x
3	Pusa (Bihar)	4	69	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	47.8	N.A.	N.A.	10.1
4	Kolhapur (Bombay)	6	104	13.5	Nil	2.5	1.0	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra).	5	51	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	x	x	x	x
6	Morsi (Madhya Pradesh).	4	80	45.0	2.2	11.8	6.3	1.3	2.2	Nil	1.3	1.3	2.2	Nil	1.3	x	x	x	x
7	Erode (Madras)	4	71	59.2	3.2	12.5	8.5	x	x	x	x	38.0	Nil	19.4	8.5	x	x	x	x

8	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat).	4	82	40.2	4.8	30.0	17.1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
9	Bhadrak (Orissa) .	2	50	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	x	x	x	x
10	Batala (Punjab) .	5	74	82.2	7.7	34.3	20.3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
11	Sonepat (Punjab) .	4	74	63.5	15.0	47.1	29.7	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
12	Chalakudy (Kerala) .	3	130	75.4	Nil	23.3	16.2	7.7	2.5	5.6	4.6	6.2	5.0	3.3	3.9	x	x	x	x
13	Bhathat (U. P.) .	6	67	x	x	x	x	29.9	8.1	16.7	11.9	31.3	13.5	10.0	11.9	x	x	x	x
14	Mandya (Mysore) .	5	53	9.4	3.9	Nil	1.9	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
15	Ashta (Bhopal) . .	4	99	x	x	x	x	57.6	2.2	13.0	8.1	x	x	x	x	38.4	N.A.	N.A.	2.0

NOTE.—x—Not Applicable.
N.R.—Not Resented.
N.A.—Not available.

TABLE 9—*Suggestions for augmenting resources of Panchayats*

Sl. No.	Centre/State	Total No. of Respondents	No. of persons reporting	Percentage of persons reporting to total (Col. 4 to 3)	Knowledgeable		Non-Knowledgeable		Specific suggestions for augmenting the resources and the percentage of reporting respondents giving these suggestions.
					No. reporting	Percentage to total no. of reporting respondents (Col. 6 to Col. 4)	No. reporting	Percentage to total No. of reporting respondents (Col. 8 to Col. 4)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad) . .	28	6	21.4	5	83.3	1	16.7	1. Enforcement of present taxes 5 (83.3)
2	Cachar (Assam) . . .	48	14	29.2	12	85.7	2	14.3	1. Subscription & contributions 4 (28.6) 2. Development of pisciculture 5 (35.7) 3. Income from fish ponds 9 (64.3) 4. Starting of cottage industries 7 (50.6)
3	Pusa (Bihar)	69	39	56.5	32	82.0	7	17.9	1. Enforcement of present tax 24 (61.5)
4	Kolhapur (Bombay) . .	104	56	53.8	43	76.8	13	23.2	1. Higher shop tax 13(23.2) 2. Auction of common land 9 (16.1) 3. Tax on ceremonies 9 (16.1)
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra) .	51	31	60.7	26	83.9	5	16.1	1. Subscription and contributions 31 (100.0) 2. Higher shop tax 11 (35.5)

6 Morsi (Madhya Pradesh)	80	51	63.7	40	78.4	11	21.5	1. Grant of 'C' class land for cultivation 41 (80.4) 2. Cattle tax & cattle pond income 24 (47.1)
7 Erode (Madras)	71	5	7.0	5	100.0	Nil	Nil	. .
8 Rajpur (Madhya Bharat)	82	16	19.5	16	100.0	Nil	Nil	1. Tax on refuge collected on community land 5 (31.3) 2. Starting Melas 5 (31.3)
9 Bhadrak (Orissa)	50	29	58.0	18	62.1	11	37.2	1. Collection of income tax 12 (41.4) 2. Development of pisciculture 28 (96.6)
10 Batala (Punjab)	74	64	86.9	37	57.8	27	42.2	1. Subscription and contribution from the people 18 (28.1) 2. Better management of common land 48 (75.0)
11 Sonepat (Punjab)	74	28	37.8	18	64.3	10	35.7	1. Wheel tax 4 (14.3) 2. Irrigation tax 5 (17.9)
12 Chalakudy (Kerala)	130	61	46.9	29	47.5	32	52.5	1. More tax on rich 31 (50.8) 2. Wheel tax 9 (14.7) 3. Profession Tax 12 (19.7)
13 Bhathat (U. P.)	67	9	13.4	8	88.9	1	11.1	1. Collection of land revenue 2 (22.2) 2. Planting fruit trees on common land 6 (66.7) 3. Better management of common land 3 (33.3)
14 Mandya (Mysore)	53	24	45.3	24	100.0	Nil	Nil	1. Higher income tax, shop tax 24 (100.0) 2. Vacant site tax 11 (45.0)
15 Ashta (Bhopal)	99	45	45.5	32	71.1	13	28.9	1. Better management of common land 33 (73.3)
TOTAL	1,080	478	44.3	345	71.2	133	27.8	

TABLE 10—*Percentage of Respondents Reporting Panchayats as useful or not useful etc.*

Sl. No.	Centre/State	Total No. of Respondents			Percentage of Respondents Reporting Panchayat as						No Response or not Reported		
					Useful			Not useful					
		Knowledgeable	Non-knowledgeable	Total	Knowledgeable	Non-knowledgeable	Total	Knowledgeable	Non-Knowledgeable	Total	Knowledgeable	Non-knowledgeable	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad)	18	10	28	100.0	90.0	96.4	Nil	10.0	3.7	Nil	Nil	Nil
2	Cachar (Assam)	18	30	48	88.9	23.3	47.9	5.6	53.3	35.4	5.7	23.3	16.7
3	Pusa (Bihar)	34	35	69	91.2	68.6	79.7	5.9	22.9	14.5	2.9	8.7	5.8
4	Kolhapur (Bombay)	64	40	104	48.4	32.5	42.2	50.0	62.5	56.7	1.6	Nil	1.0
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra)	29	22	51	93.1	90.0	92.1	3.5	4.6	3.9	3.5	4.6	3.9
6	Morsi (Madhya Pradesh)	46	34	80	76.0	67.6	72.5	23.9	32.4	27.5	Nil	Nil	Nil
7	Erode (Madras)	31	40	71	80.6	87.5	84.5	16.1	12.5	14.1	3.2	Nil	1.4
8	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat)	42	40	82	95.2	65.0	80.4	4.8	27.5	15.9	Nil	7.5	3.7
9	Bhadrak (Orissa)	20	30	50	90.0	63.3	74.0	10.0	33.3	24.0	Nil	3.3	2.0
10	Batala (Punjab)	39	35	74	97.4	85.7	91.9	2.6	14.3	8.1	Nil	Nil	Nil
11	Sonepat (Punjab)	40	34	74	90.0	82.4	86.5	10.0	11.8	10.8	Nil	5.9	2.7
12	Chalakudy (Kerala)	40	90	130	92.5	74.4	80.0	5.0	25.6	19.2	2.5	Nil	0.8
13	Bhathat (U. P.)	37	30	67	100.0	96.6	98.5	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	3.4	1.5
14	Mandya (Mysore)	26	27	53	73.0	25.9	49.0	26.9	40.7	34.0	Nil	33.3	17.0
15	Ashta (Bhopal)	45	54	99	73.3	59.2	64.6	26.7	40.7	34.3	Nil	1.9	1.1
	TOTAL	529	551	1,080	83.3	66.8	74.9	15.5	28.1	21.9	1.1	5.1	3.1

TABLE 11—*Suggestions given by the Respondents to improve the day to-day functioning of the Panchayats*

Sl. No.	Centre/State	Total No. of respondents	No. of Respondents Reporting	% age of reporting respondents (col. 4) suggesting					
				Frequent inspection by Panchayat Officer	Frequent meeting of Panchayat and the Community	Panchayat should not associate itself with Politics	Appointment of educated, trained and full time secretary	Unanimity in decision	Proper auditing of accounts
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad)	28	17 (60.7)	11 (64.7)	6 (35.3)	2 (11.8)	..	1 (5.9)	..
2	Cachar (Assam)	48	12 (25.0)	7 (58.3)	7 (58.3)	4 (33.3)	..	..	..
3	Pusa (Bihar)	69	45 (65.2)	14 (31.1)	12 (26.7)	..	..	..	..
4	Kolhapur (Bombay)	104	91 (87.5)	60 (65.9)	70 (76.9)	30 (33.0)	2 (2.2)	4 (4.4)	..
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra)	51	37 (72.6)	31 (83.8)	16 (43.2)	..	..	..	..
6	Morsi (Madhya Pradesh)	80	54 (67.5)	8 (14.8)	32 (59.3)	3 (5.6)	8 (14.8)	5 (9.3)	..
7	Erode (Madras)	71	64 (90.1)	5 (7.8)	58 (90.6)	9 (14.1)	..	24 (37.5)	..
8	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat)	82	57 (69.5)	24 (42.1)	9 (15.8)	3 (5.3)	19 (33.3)	..	6 (10.5)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9	Bhadrak (Orissa)	50	40 (80.0)	29 (72.5)	23 (57.5)	2 (5.0)	1 (2.5)	2 (5.0)	5 (12.5)
10	Batala (Punjab)	74	73 (98.7)	34 (46.6)	24 (32.9)	6 (8.2)	4 (5.5)	12 (16.4)	15 (20.6)
11	Sonepat (Punjab)	74	51 (68.9)	36 (70.6)	10 (19.6)	..	6 (11.8)	..	15 (29.4)
12	Chalakudy (Kerala)	130	63 (48.5)	23 (36.5)	15 (28.8)	9 (14.3)	..	2 (3.2)	..
13	Bhathat (Uttar Pradesh)	67	3 (4.5)	3 (100.0)	1 (33.3)	..	..	..	..
14	Mandya (Mysore)	53	24 (45.3)	13 (54.2)	20 (83.3)	1 (4.2)	1 (4.2)	2 (8.3)	..
15	Ashta (Bhopal)	99	64 (64.7)	39 (60.9)	30 (46.9)	..	16 (25.0)	4 (6.3)	..
	TOTAL	1,080	695 (64.4)	337 (48.5)	333 (47.3)	69 (9.9)	57 (8.2)	56 (8.1)	41 (5.9)

NOTE.—Figures within brackets are percentages.

TABLE 12—*No. of Respondents giving First or Second priority to Financial, Technical and Adminstrative Aid, to improve the Functioning of the Panchayats*

Sl. No.	Centre/State	No. of Respondents	No. of Respondents giving 1st or 2nd priority to Financial Aid	No. of Respondents giving 1st or 2nd priority to Technical Aid	No. of Respondents giving 1st or 2nd priority to Administrative Aid
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad)	28	17	7	9
2	Cachar (Assam)	48	11	6	4
3	Pusa (Bihar)	69	32	31	28
4	Kolhapur (Bombay)	104	48	25	36
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra)	51	31	Nil	32
6	Morsi (Madhya Pradesh)	80	73	69	18
7	Erode (Madras)	71	71	42	3
8	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat)	82	4	12	26
9	Bhadrak (Orissa)	50	41	20	14
10	Batala (Punjab)	74	71	69	2
11	Sonepat (Punjab)	74	57	29	24
12	Chalakudy (Kerala)	130	90	80	26
13	Bhathat (Uttar Pradesh)	67	7	Nil	1
14	Mandya (Mysore)	53	27	5	12
15	Ashta (Bhopal)	99	30	7	22
	TOTAL	1,080	618	402	257

TABLE 13—*Attitude towards giving the panchayats more powers, by specific items*

Sl. No.	Centre/State	Total No. of Respondents	Compulsory levy of labour			Management of village land			Collection of land revenue			Maintenance of land Records			Panchayats as the main agency for channelising Govt. Assistance		
			Yes	No	No response or not reported	Yes	No	No response or not reported	Yes	No	No response or not reported	Yes	No	No response or not reported	Yes	No	No response or not reported
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1	Bodhan (Hyderabad)	28	25.0	67.9	7.1	67.9	17.9	14.2	32.1	39.3	28.6	28.6	42.9	28.6	75.0	10.7	14.3
2	Cachar (Assam)	48	77.1	10.4	12.5	35.4	10.4	54.2	6.4	4.2	35.4	45.8	20.8	33.4	29.2	16.7	55.1
3	Pusa (Bihar)	69	84.1	8.7	7.2	85.5	10.1	4.4	73.9	14.5	11.6	75.4	13.0	11.6	76.8	4.4	18.8
4	Kolhapur (Bombay)	104	68.3	27.9	3.9	66.4	19.2	14.4	36.5	52.9	10.6	29.8	59.6	10.6	70.2	24.0	5.8
5	Manavadar (Saurashtra)	51	Nil	92.2	7.8	90.2	Nil	9.8	92.2	Nil	7.8	90.2	Nil	9.8	2.0	45.1	52.9
6	Morsi (Madhya Pradesh)	80	62.5	35.0	2.5	33.8	52.5	13.7	45.0	10.0	45.0	40.0	33.8	26.2	68.8	22.5	8.7
7	Erode (Madras)	71	Nil	98.6	1.4	93.0	5.6	1.4	4.2	94.4	1.4	4.2	94.4	1.4	38.0	56.3	5.6
8	Rajpur (Madhya Bharat)	82	81.7	1.2	17.1	68.3	9.8	22.0	67.1	13.4	19.5	34.2	43.9	22.0	78.1	1.2	20.7
9	Bhadrak (Orissa)	50	62.0	38.0	Nil	56.0	42.0	2.0	40.0	58.0	2.0	34.0	64.0	2.0	58.0	42.0	Nil
10	Batala (Punjab)	74	100.0	Nil	Nil	100.0	Nil	Nil	79.7	17.6	2.7	32.4	63.1	4.1	87.8	8.1	14.1
11	Sonepat (Punjab)	74	82.4	12.2	5.4	70.3	24.3	5.4	59.5	21.6	18.9	27.0	62.2	10.8	94.6	1.4	4.1
12	Chalakudy (Kerala)	130	47.7	50.8	1.5	60.0	33.9	6.1	33.1	31.5	35.4	40.8	26.9	32.3	74.6	20.0	5.4
13	Bhathat (Uttar Pradesh)	67	89.6	7.5	3.0	35.8	4.5	59.7	91.0	4.5	4.5	91.0	4.5	4.5	88.1	1.5	10.5
14	Mandya (Mysore)	53	54.7	Nil	45.3	24.5	24.5	50.9	18.9	32.1	49.1	18.9	32.1	49.1	49.1	1.9	49.1
15	Ashta (Bhopal)	99	88.9	10.1	1.0	84.9	5.1	10.1	13.1	70.7	16.2	Nil	91.9	8.1	58.6	31.3	10.1
	TOTAL	1080	64.4	29.1	6.6	65.9	18.1	16.0	48.0	32.7	19.4	37.7	45.7	16.6	65.9	19.3	14.8

NOTE.—Figures are in percentage to total.

GIPN—S2—2 Plann. Com./58. 17-6-58.—5,000.

List of P.E.O. Publications

1. Group Dynamics in a North Indian Village.
2. Evaluation Report on First Years' Working of Community Projects.
3. Community Projects—First Reactions.
4. Training of Village Leaders in Bhopal.
5. Cotton Extension in P.E.P.S.U.—A case Study.
6. Evaluation Report on Second Years' Working of Community Projects (Vols. I & II).
7. Evaluation Report on Second Years' Working of Community Projects (Summary).
8. Training of Village Artisans in Bihar.
9. Leadership and Groups in a South Indian Village.
10. Evaluation Report on Working of Community Projects and N.E.S. Blocks (April 1956).
11. Evaluation Report on Working of Community Projects and N.E.S. Blocks (April 1956) —Summary.
12. Bench Mark Survey Report—Batala (Punjab).
13. Bench Mark Survey Report—Bhadrak (Orissa).
14. Three Years of Community Projects.
15. Study of Village Artisans.
16. Bench Mark Survey Report—Kolhapur (Bombay).
17. Bench Mark Survey Report—Morsi (Madhya Pradesh).
18. Studies in Cooperative Farming.
19. Fourth Evaluation Report on Working of Community Projects and N.E.S. Block (April 1957)—Vol. I.
20. Fourth Evaluation Report on Working of Community Projects and N.E.S. Blocks (May 1957)—Vol. II.
21. Bench Mark Survey Reports—Malavalli (Mysore) and Chalakudy (Kerala). In Press.
22. Bench Mark Survey Reports—Banswada (Andhra), Samalkot (Andhra) and Erode (Madras). Blocks (In Press).
23. Bench Mark Survey Reports—Pusa (Bihar), Mohd. Bazar (West Bengal and Arunachal (Assam). Blocks (In Press).
24. Bench Mark Survey Reports—Paunta (Himachal Pradesh), Bhadson (Punjab) and Bhathat (Uttar Pradesh). Blocks (In Press).
25. Bench Mark Survey Reports—Manavadar (Bombay), Nowgong (Madhya Pradesh) and Rajpur (Madhya Pradesh). Blocks (In Press).

P.C.64.
5,000

PRINTED IN INDIA, BY THE MANAGER, GOVT. OF INDIA PRESS, NASIK ROAD, PUBLISHED BY THE MANAGER OF PUBLICATIONS, DELHI
1958